

March 8, 1966

Exports of free world countries to North Vietnam, January-June 1965—Continued

[Value in thousands of U.S. dollars]

Exporting country	Total to world	Total to Sino-Soviet bloc	Percent of total value	North Viet-nam	Exporting country	Total to world	Total to Sino-Soviet bloc	Percent of total value	North Viet-nam
LATIN AMERICA					LATIN AMERICA—continued				
Argentina.....	731,295	60,168	8.2	(1)	Peru (January-February).....	96,136	1,079	1.1	(1)
Brazil.....	648,000	37,947	5.9	(1)	Uruguay.....	91,400	6,388	5.9	
Chile.....	352,009	329	0.1	(1)					
Colombia.....	267,983	5,119	2.0	(1)	Cocoon countries, total.....	53,328,021	1,611,739	3.0	4,559
Jamaica.....	119,228	1		(1)	European Cocoon countries, total.....	32,483,727	1,240,559	3.8	2,632
Mexico.....	555,200	38,559	6.9	(1)					

¹ Not available.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDUCATORS OPPOSE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL TO CUT BACK NDEA STUDENT LOANS

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, on February 23 I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page 3712—the objections registered by the banking community through the American Bankers Association to the administration proposals to shift the National Defense Education Act student loan program to the newly authorized subsidized loan guarantee program enacted as title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

As I indicated in my remarks, bankers and educators stand together in their opposition to this proposal. Opposition was also most recently voiced by a number of my colleagues on the Senate Education Committee who on March 2 joined in a colloquy on the Senate floor in which we expressed our reservations to this and other parts of the administration's fiscal year 1967 education program.

I have received many letters from New York and other educators expressing their views. Most recently, Dr. Clifford Lord, president of Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y., wrote me setting forth his views and detailing how the administration's proposal would adversely affect both students and the college.

I ask unanimous consent to include President Lord's letter with my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY,
Hempstead, N.Y., March 3, 1966.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Serving on the Education Subcommittee of the Senate, I know you are aware of some of the problems being encountered by colleges and universities as a result of proposed cutbacks in the National Defense Education Act loan fund program. Permit me to describe the situation as it affects this university.

During the current academic year we have received and distributed approximately \$500,000 in national defense loan funds to 561 students. More than half of this money

(\$289,000) has been directed toward students who are preparing for teaching careers. As you know, the National Defense Education Act program provides that if these students teach for 5 years after graduation, up to 50 percent of the sum borrowed would be forgiven. Therefore, many of the Hofstra students intending to enter teaching, view the National Defense Education Act loans as equivalent to a half scholarship.

Our request for the academic year 1966-67, submitted on January 17, 1966, called for an increase to \$600,000 in National Defense Education Act funds. This was based on an expanding student population and a growing tendency among students to regard education as an investment justifying borrowing.

Information now at hand indicates that President Johnson has asked the Congress to reduce the budget for these loans from \$180 million to \$30 million. This is a drastic cut especially when growing college enrollments would argue for greater sums to be made available. In place of these Federal funds the President has recommended the creation of State-sponsored federally guaranteed loans which would duplicate the program already in existence in New York, under the New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. Many Hofstra students, where their financial need is great, already have both National Defense Education Act and New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. loans.

The consequence of this change in policy would in our judgment be disastrous. Hofstra's financial aid officer estimates a loss of over 80 percent of the National Defense Education Act funds received in 1965-66, and an inability on our part to meet more than a handful of the requests to renew National Defense Education Act loans for our students who are using them to meet educational expenses. This would compel many undergraduates currently receiving national defense student loans, and other students planning to attend Hofstra who require financial assistance, to turn to the New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. for aid. However, loans from this agency, though they carry the same interest rate, lack several advantages of the National Defense Education loans:

1. They are not available to out-of-State residents;
2. They have no provision for forgiveness; hence the full amount would have to be repaid by those preparing to teach;
3. The university has no control over these loans, as they must be forwarded to Albany for clearance; the normal time for processing is 4 to 6 weeks. With National Defense Education Act loan assistance can be immediately provided;
4. Time for processing the loans will be considerably increased since they will have to be approved in Albany and then funded by a local bank;
5. The university has no control over the New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. loans, and cannot offer the student a financial aid package to meet his needs, or to attract students to our campus, as was possible when working with the National Defense Education Act loans for both in- and out-of-State students.

In short, the change in the national student loan funds largely cancels out a valuable program of financial assistance which the Congress and administration have evolved, and will adversely affect the educational opportunity of hundreds of our students especially those preparing for teaching careers.

We ask your help in restoring the national defense loan funds available to students with due recognition of the increased needs of students for this type of assistance.

May I take this opportunity to refer to a second aspect of Federal aid to education which has created some concern; namely, the delay in formulating and announcing guidelines to govern applications under the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Congress and administration deserve much credit for designing this act intended to benefit colleges and universities throughout the Nation. Title II of the act covering libraries is still unfounded, and I hope that the Congress will appropriate funds for this title during the present session.

However, my chief concern is with the considerable delay on the part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in furnishing guidelines to colleges and universities for the funded portions of the act. Only 4 months of fiscal 1966 remain, but we do not yet have the criteria and format for titles I, III, and VI. Briefing sessions on the guidelines were held last October by HEW, the State of New York has had committees formulating in-State policy for the various titles, various program have been submitted to Albany, but no Federal guidelines are available. The State of New York and its institutions have settled down to exasperated waiting. A recent report on title VI prepared by the New York State Education Department calling for the State's colleges and universities to bear with us.

Title IV guidelines have been issued and Hofstra applied for economic opportunity loans on January 17, 1966. However, no word has been received. This is distressing because commitments must be made to bright but needy students in the spring for the following academic year. Until we hear from HEW, we cannot make these commitments.

I recognize that the Federal Government fears that rising expenditures for the Vietnam war, coming at a time of high spending by consumers and business, may create a dangerously inflationary situation. Under the circumstances the Federal Government may indeed wish to slow down many of the Great Society programs so recently enacted by the Congress. This may account for the delays in processing applications, the delays in issuing guidelines, the cutbacks in programs.

But education is not the logical field to slow down. I know that you, Senator, are mindful of the great dependence of this Nation upon its colleges and universities and the men and women they educate, and I hope that you will not allow the needed stream of Federal aid to education to be damned or diverted.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD LORD,
President.

March 8, 1966

5009

Imports of free world countries from North Vietnam, January-June 1965

(Value in thousands of U.S. dollars)

Importing country	Total from world	Total from Sino-Soviet bloc	Percent of total value	North Vietnam	Importing country	Total from world	Total from Sino-Soviet bloc	Percent of total value	North Vietnam
Total of listed countries		3,165,128		15,270	AFRICA				
United States	10,102,593	65,942	0.7	(1)	Angola	78,221	230	.3	(1)
Canada	3,773,324	21,146	.6	(1)	Ghana	183,765	41,532	22.6	(1)
European (OECD) countries, total	42,309,032	1,687,498	4.0	3,384	Kenya	121,755	2,915	2.4	(1)
Austria	979,528	101,996	10.4	24	Malagasy Republic	66,295	1,267	1.9	(1)
Belgium-Luxembourg	3,080,767	62,023	2.0	423	Mali	19,297	7,782	40.3	(1)
Denmark	1,431,149	60,488	4.2		Morocco	209,558	12,229	5.8	(1)
France	4,884,462	150,035	3.1	2,261	Niger	18,480	1,154	6.2	(1)
Germany, Federal Republic of	8,496,468	405,922	4.8	97	Nigeria	381,300	16,000	4.2	(1)
Greece	542,862	49,197	9.1	(1)	Rhodesia (Southern)	164,716	456	.3	(1)
Ireland	65,655	9,073	13.8		Senegal	89,276	1,604	1.8	(1)
Italy	538,915	9,044	1.7	(1)	Sierra Leone	62,200	2,800	5.4	(1)
Netherlands	3,552,279	228,906	6.4	134	South Africa, Republic of (January-April)	826,800	2,800	.3	(1)
Norway	3,556,547	81,508	2.3	352	Tanzania	63,531	2,268	3.6	(1)
Portugal	1,097,327	32,820	3.0		Togo	23,622	973	4.1	(1)
Spain	408,303	6,825	1.7	(1)	Tunisia	129,620	5,033	3.9	(1)
Sweden	1,415,401	29,430	2.1		Uganda	58,256	1,605	2.8	(1)
Switzerland	2,165,115	94,504	4.4	(1)	Zambia	140,244	232	.2	(1)
Turkey	1,817,157	38,207	2.1	6	FAR EAST				
United Kingdom	7,996,086	301,460	3.8	87	Burma	126,800	25,000	19.7	
Finland	826,264	151,645	18.4		Cambodia	48,100	13,200	27.4	1,209
Yugoslavia	620,068	168,423	27.1	(1)	Ceylon	166,830	41,162	24.6	(1)
EUROPE, OTHER					Hong Kong	786,159	202,930	25.8	1,311
Cyprus	66,703	4,189	6.3		India	1,351,582	139,361	10.3	
Iran	439,121	20,736	4.7		Japan	4,145,455	252,844	6.1	6,466
Israel	414,587	7,000	1.7	(1)	Malaya and Singapore	788,006	54,395	7.2	909
Jordan	72,829	7,190	9.9		Pakistan	578,280	28,957	5.0	
Libya	144,399	9,276	6.4	(1)	Taiwan	257,781	349	.1	(1)
Malta (January-March)	22,966	1,380	6.0	(1)	Thailand	339,300	3,900	1.1	(1)
Mudan (January-April)	61,254	6,218	10.2		OCEANIA				
Syria	100,800	14,900	14.7	(1)	Australia	1,064,396	31,168	1.9	(1)
United Arab Republic (Egypt) (January-March)	198,474	39,323	19.8	(1)	New Zealand	440,983	2,841	.6	
MIDDLE EAST					LATIN AMERICA				
Argentina	583,164	18,541	3.2		Argentina	583,164	18,541	3.2	
Brazil	514,091	34,541	6.7	(1)	Brazil	514,091	34,541	6.7	(1)
British Guiana (January-February)	14,083	366	2.6	(1)	British Guiana (January-February)	14,083	366	2.6	(1)
Chile	247,775	617	.3	(1)	Chile	247,775	617	.3	(1)
Colombia	237,314	4,552	1.9	(1)	Colombia	237,314	4,552	1.9	(1)
Jamaica	147,544	49	.0	(1)	Jamaica	147,544	49	.0	(1)
Mexico	741,162	2,551	.3	(1)	Mexico	741,162	2,551	.3	(1)
Peru (January-February)	93,720	281	.3	(1)	Peru (January-February)	93,720	281	.3	(1)
Trinidad and Tobago	240,258	353	.1	(1)	Trinidad and Tobago	240,258	353	.1	(1)
Uruguay	93,700	1,421	1.5		Uruguay	93,700	1,421	1.5	
Coccom countries, total	53,348,633	1,745,176	3.3	9,820	Coccom countries, total	53,348,633	1,745,176	3.3	9,820
European Coccom countries, total	35,327,261	1,405,244	4.0	3,354	European Coccom countries, total	35,327,261	1,405,244	4.0	3,354

1 Not available.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Exports of free world countries to North Vietnam, January-June 1965

(Value in thousands of U.S. dollars)

Exporting country	Total to world	Total to Sino-Soviet bloc	Percent of total value	North Vietnam	Exporting country	Total to world	Total to Sino-Soviet bloc	Percent of total value	North Vietnam
Total of listed countries		3,107,310		7,168	AFRICA				
United States	13,195,932	64,313	0.5	(1)	Angola	95,642	983	1.0	(1)
Canada	3,724,778	95,305	2.6	(1)	Ghana	179,830	36,657	20.4	(1)
European (OECD) countries, total	37,325,682	1,499,179	4.0	2,604	Kenya	76,771	2,811	3.7	(1)
Austria	755,148	113,356	15.0	1	Malagasy Republic	39,225	718	1.8	(1)
Belgium-Luxembourg	3,117,248	50,973	1.6	881	Mali	9,411	595	6.3	(1)
Denmark	1,099,456	49,785	4.5	68	Morocco	236,477	23,425	9.9	(1)
France	4,884,462	174,590	3.6	1,308	Nigeria	377,500	17,400	4.6	(1)
Germany, Federal Republic of	8,806,425	433,395	4.9	45	Rhodesia (Southern)	165,409	1,493	.9	(1)
Greece	138,193	45,304	28.6	(1)	South Africa, Republic of (January-April)	484,400	300	.1	(1)
Ireland	37,029	7,957	14.0		Tanzania	83,679	5,127	6.1	(1)
Italy	275,916	1,765	.6	(1)	Togo	14,933	600	4.0	(1)
Netherlands	3,150,699	187,083	5.4	65	Tunisia	63,259	4,182	6.6	(1)
Norway	3,957,698	52,010	1.7	68	Uganda	95,467	11,098	11.6	(1)
Portugal	703,004	30,011	4.3		Zambia	248,822	5,452	2.2	(1)
Spain	426,532	2,483	1.0	(1)	FAR EAST				
Sweden	1,915,371	9,684	2.2	2	Afghanistan	35,300	11,500	32.6	(1)
Switzerland	1,401,959	83,446	4.4		Burma	114,109	20,890	18.2	
Turkey	2,065,540	34,670	16.9	(1)	Cambodia	56,500	6,400	9.6	800
United Kingdom	6,748,218	180,257	2.7	137	Ceylon	195,382	36,701	18.8	(1)
Finland	644,956	132,256	20.5		Hong Kong	419,421	1,972	.5	64
Yugoslavia	480,837	197,051	41.0	(1)	India	817,258	147,929	18.1	
EUROPE, OTHER					Japan	3,923,584	211,562	5.4	2,027
Cyprus	34,529	4,392	12.7		Malaya and Singapore	668,232	64,379	9.6	1,659
Iran	642,000	23,810	3.7		Pakistan	262,839	34,616	13.2	(1)
Israel	243,951	8,332	3.4	(1)	Thailand	297,600	2,900	1.0	(1)
Jordan	9,633	752	7.8		OCEANIA				
Libya	359,849	215	.1	(1)	Australia	1,499,613	159,051	10.6	(1)
Sudan (January-April)	64,413	8,770	13.6	(1)	New Zealand	576,318	9,823	1.7	14
Syria	86,400	35,100	40.6	(1)					
United Arab Republic (Egypt) (January-March)	178,926	71,066	39.7	(1)					

Footnotes at end of table.

There being no objection, the letters and schedule were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1966.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: We appreciate having a copy of your speech to the Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association in New York, on January 26, which you enclosed with your letter of February 14 to the Secretary.

You said you would be interested in the administration's position concerning your proposal that we vigorously press our allies and other nations to eliminate their trading with North Vietnam.

We have been giving continuing attention to the problem of both trade and shipping by the free world with North Vietnam. As you noted in your speech, the volume of the trade is small. It amounts to only 15 percent of North Vietnam's total trade, and is nonstrategic in nature. It is, furthermore, subject to the strategic embargo restrictions of the Coordinating Committee (Cocom) countries. Free world exports to North Vietnam consist mostly of textiles, foodstuffs, and fertilizer. Imports from North Vietnam are mainly anthracite, apatite, rattanware, fruits, and vegetables. Enclosed are lists of free world imports and exports to North Vietnam for 1963, 1964, and the first 6 months of 1965 that were prepared by the Department of Commerce. Although we do not yet have data on free world trade with North Vietnam for the last half of 1965, we believe that there will be a decrease in that trade in view of the sharp drop in free world shipping to North Vietnam during the last half of 1965.

Since free world trade moves almost entirely by sea, we have approached other countries on this problem in terms of controlling this shipping. (Such an approach is consistent with relevant legislation and has been remarkably successful.) Furthermore, it is a more constructive approach to countries which would find it difficult to support our Vietnam policy if we attempted to persuade them to impose an embargo on all trade with North Vietnam.

As the Secretary indicated in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee on February 18, we have made vigorous representations to those free world countries whose nationals have been engaged in shipping with North Vietnam.

As a result of these representations and continued followup efforts, the number of ships involved in the trade has declined sharply. For the last 6 months the monthly average of calls by free world vessels at Haiphong has dropped to 14 as compared with 34 per month in 1964. We are still working hard on the problem of bringing these voyages down as far as possible, and we hope

very much that there will be further reductions.

During 1965 free world countries having ships in the North Vietnam trade were: Cyprus, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, and Panama. During the last 6 months of 1965, no Italian, Japanese, Lebanese, Netherlands, or Panamanian ships called at North Vietnamese ports. During this latter period France and Liberia each had a ship making one call.

With respect to the question of existing or proposed legislation to terminate aid to countries still engaged in trade and shipping with North Vietnam, I should like to point out that only four aid-recipient countries had ships calling at North Vietnam ports during the last 6 months of 1965; namely Cyprus, Greece, Liberia, and Norway. Some of the ships of these countries were under long-term charters to Communist countries and not under control of their owners. However, we have already had assurances in some cases that once these charters expire, the ships will be removed from the North Vietnam trade. All of the four aid-recipient countries are taking steps to remove their ships from the trade in order to continue to qualify for United States aid. For example in the case of Liberia the Government has issued regulations making it unlawful for its ships to carry cargo to or from North Vietnam. We will, of course, keep the effectiveness of these measures under continuing review. It should be pointed out that Great Britain, which has by far the largest number of free world vessels in the North Vietnam trade, is not an aid recipient.

The problem is particularly complex with respect to ships under British registry. The majority of these vessels in the North Vietnam trade are small coastal vessels owned and registered in Hong Kong by Chinese Communist operators, yet by virtue of their registry are entitled to fly the British flag. They are on time charters to Communist China and normally ply in trade only between mainland China and North Vietnam.

Secretary Rusk took up the problem of British-flag shipping in the North Vietnam trade with Foreign Secretary Stewart in January. Under Secretary Mann discussed the problem with British Ambassador Dean in December and again in January. Subsequently, during the week of February 1 Assistant Secretary Solomon discussed the problem with the Foreign Secretary and other responsible British officials in London. If British-flag vessels could be removed from the North Vietnam trade, we would have arrived at the virtually irreducible minimum of free world involvement in North Vietnam shipping. There still might be an occasional free world ship calling in North Vietnam as there will also remain the possibility of an occasional voyage that results from an unexpired time charter contract held by a Com-

munist country and that the owner is not able to prevent.

With respect to your suggestion that the ships of those nations continuing in trade with North Vietnam be blacklisted, I would call your attention to the announcement by the Maritime Administration on February 12 in the Federal Register that the President had approved a policy of barring U.S. Government financed cargoes shipped from the United States from foreign-flag ships calling at North Vietnam on or after January 25, 1966. This announcement contained a list of five free world ships which have recently visited North Vietnam and which are therefore barred from the carriage of U.S.-financed goods from U.S. ports. Further lists will be published at frequent intervals.

The policy directive barring U.S. Government financed cargoes to ships calling at North Vietnam was calculated to supplement our diplomatic approaches and the action taken against recipients of U.S. aid. It is believed that these measures will be adequate to remove practically all the remaining free world shipping from the North Vietnam trade. If, however, these measures are not successful further action will have to be considered.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you, and I trust that you will let me know if there are further questions.

Sincerely,
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

FEBRUARY 14, 1966.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DEAN: On January 26 I made a speech to the Freight Forwarders Association in New York City on the subject of East-West trade.

In that speech, among others, I recommended that the United States vigorously press our allies and other nations trading with North Vietnam to eliminate this trade in view of the situation in that part of southeast Asia. I also recommended that, should this effort fail, we should cut off economic and military assistance to countries continuing this trade and that at some point put the ships of these nations on a blacklist. A copy of this speech is enclosed for your information.

I would be interested to know what the administration's position is on this issue, what have we done to eliminate this trade, and what this trade amounts to currently including the countries, number of vessels, and products involved in this trade.

Your earliest response will be appreciated.

With warm regards.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

Free world countries trading with North Vietnam, 1963 and 1964

[Value in thousands of U.S. dollars]

Countries	1964 exports to North Vietnam	1964 imports from North Vietnam	1963 exports to North Vietnam	1963 imports from North Vietnam	Countries	1964 exports to North Vietnam	1964 imports from North Vietnam	1963 exports to North Vietnam	1963 imports from North Vietnam
Austria.....		58		28	Cambodia.....	1,188	1,266	580	1,400
Belgium-Luxembourg.....		767		1,514	Ceylon.....	59			
Denmark.....	12	10	41	5	Tunisia.....		1		
France.....	2,551	3,740	2,542	3,600	Hong Kong.....	88	3,729	162	3,304
Federal Republic of Germany.....	1,108	236	323	191	India.....	12		81	
Ireland.....				3	Japan.....	3,372	9,842	4,316	10,255
Italy.....	1,274	278	2,207	593	Malaya and Singapore.....	1,288	1,434	1,296	1,434
Netherlands.....	144	1,312	167	2,276	Pakistan.....			163	
Sweden.....		7	167	2	New Zealand.....	24		27	
Switzerland.....	79	69	72	70	Senegal.....			3	
United Kingdom.....	101	165	102	73	Argentina.....	606			
Finland.....	6				Mexico.....	95			3
Jordan.....		4		27	Australia.....			350	
United Arab Republic (Egypt).....	200	380	140	9					
Morocco.....	12		11	3					
Ivory Coast.....		105		1					
					Total.....	12,221	23,409	12,751	24,800

1 January-October.

Source: Department of Commerce.

sions that we assumed the labor safeguard contained in the 1952 act was fulfilling its intended purpose.

What is the essential difference between the labor provision enacted in 1952 and the more restrictive provision contained in Public Law 89-236? Prior to December 1, 1965, the responsibility for taking the initiative to establish displacement of American workers or adverse effect on wages and working conditions devolved upon the Secretary of Labor. The labor restriction had no force in the absence of a certification and, as a matter of fact, the provisions of section 212(a) (14) were completely dormant for 4½ years after the McCarran-Walter Act came into force. The preamendment certifications of the Secretary of Labor had the effect of excluding any intending immigrant whom the consular officer found to be within the scope of the certification. Now under the amended provisions of section 212(a) (14) a labor certification has the effect of admitting the particular immigrant or immigrants for whom it is granted, and the burden of proving nondisplacement of American workers and no adverse effect has been transferred to the American employer. There are other important differences. The labor certifications under the former law were directed against specific employers in this country or against designated geographical areas and were issued on a selective basis. They were, in other words, limited in scope as contrasted with the recently published schedule B (occupations in oversupply) which has a nationwide application. We appreciate the problem inherent in any listing of the schedule B occupations on an area-by-area basis, since this tends to invite evasion, but the language of section 212(a) (14) clearly contemplates a determination (shortage of able, willing, and qualified workers) with respect to "the place to which the alien is destined." Congressman FEIGHAN emphasized this point during the debate on H.R. 2580 when he said the following: "New labor controls are established to govern the admission of all immigrant worker classes.

"These new controls require the Secretary of Labor to make an affirmative finding on an individual case basis that, with respect to the job the immigrant worker is to fill in the locality to which he is destined, there is no able, willing, qualified and available American worker to fill that job."

In conclusion, I can assure you that the administrative officials who share responsibility for enforcement of the immigration law have been remarkably flexible in their construction and application of the new labor safeguard. Particularly commendable was the action of the Secretary of Labor in giving a blanket certification for some 150 Polish immigrants who, short of processing passports, had qualified for visas in all respects when the new law came into force. Equally commendable was his ruling that Cuban parolees in the United States are not subject to the labor certification when they apply for immigrant visas abroad. A blanket certification has been granted for persons in the service of religious denominations. There is general agreement that the labor provision applies only to the head of the family and not to his spouse and children; also, that it does not apply to the self-employed, or to those who will not be gainfully employed in this country. Doubtless there will be other rulings of a like nature. I think they reflect a disposition on the part of Government to be fair and reasonable as we strive to carry out the will of Congress. The Secretary of State in the last 2 years made four appearances before the congressional committees in support of immigration reform. Each time he accentuated three features of the former law which were adversely affecting our foreign relations; namely, the national origins quota system, the Asia-Pacific triangle restriction,

and the denial of equal status to immigrants born in two of our American Republics. These irritants were removed by the act of October 3, 1965, and this is one reason why, when we appraise that act in terms of all its provisions, the conclusion is inescapable that the immigration law today is infinitely more equitable than at any time in our history.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for recognition. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

UNITED STATES ACTS TO STOP FREE WORLD TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I call the attention of the Senate to one of the most nettling problems that faces us in North Vietnam. It is a fact that a great deal of the supplies to North Vietnam is coming by sea. Though, of course, the Soviet Union or other Communist states are shipping supplies into Vietnam, I again call attention to the fact that goods are being shipped to North Vietnam from countries in the free world, by some of our stoutest allies, including Japan and France.

It is true that ships engaged in this traffic flying the flags of Great Britain, Cyprus, Greece, Liberia, and Norway, are not always under the direct control of their governments. Nevertheless, governments can deny registration, and can persuade the owners of these ships to withdraw their vessels from the trade. It would help us if they would stop supplying that country with those supplies.

In addition, one of the countries with the most ships flying its flag, Great Britain, is a great friend of ours. I say that with no sarcasm, but with the greatest conviction. We should do all we can to get the British to call off these ships.

It is a fact that the trade is small and does not involve strategic goods. It seems to me our people should recognize the fact that it is small. Nevertheless, it is nettling to us while we expend great amounts of human and material resources in Vietnam, and it seems to me we should do all we can to get Great Britain, as well as other countries, to cut that trade materially.

On February 14 I wrote Secretary Rusk and asked him to state the administration's position on this question and to describe U.S. actions currently underway to eliminate this trade.

On March 4 I received a reply from the Department. The key points in this letter are as follows:

First. We have approached several countries involved in shipping these

goods to North Vietnam. As a result, the number of ships involved in the trade has declined sharply. For the last 6 months, the monthly average of calls by free world vessels to the port of Haiphong has dropped to 14 as compared with 34 per month in 1964.

Second. Among the countries with ships calling on North Vietnam ports, four are U.S. aid recipients: Cyprus, Greece, Liberia, and Norway. All of the four aid recipient countries are taking steps to remove their ships from the trade in order to continue to qualify for U.S. aid.

Third. Great Britain, which has by far the largest number of free world vessels in North Vietnam trade is not an aid recipient. Secretary Rusk and Under Secretary Mann are in touch with the Government of the United Kingdom to deal with the rather complex problems involved in removing British-flag vessels from this trade. Many of these ships are small coastal vessels owned and registered in Hong Kong by Chinese Communist operators, yet by virtue of their registry are entitled to fly the British flag. There is no indication in the letter of the progress being made in our talks with the United Kingdom.

Fourth. On February 12 the Maritime Administration announced in the Federal Register that the President has approved a policy of barring U.S. Government financed cargoes from foreign-flag ships calling at North Vietnam on or after January 26. Five free world ships were involved in this first announcement—three British, one Cypriot, and one Greek—and they will be barred from carrying U.S. financed cargoes from U.S. ports. These ships will be able to visit U.S. ports, however, and carry privately financed cargo.

It is my understanding that as a result of these actions, there was a sharp drop in free world trade with North Vietnam during the second half of 1965.

During the first half of 1965, free world exports to North Vietnam totaled \$7.2 million, with Japan, Malaysia, France, and the Benelux being principal exporters. Free world imports from North Vietnam in this same period totaled \$13.3 million with Japan, France, Hong Kong, and Cambodia being the principal importers. Imports from North Vietnam involved principally anthracite coal; while exports involved mostly textiles, foodstuffs, and fertilizers.

The State Department's actions to date have been effective and I hope that its further efforts will result in the elimination of this trade in the near future.

Once the Vietnam conflict has been terminated, with a just solution, it has already been made clear that we would be willing to reconsider our policy toward trade with North Vietnam and to consider seriously the inclusion of a trade agreement between the United States and North Vietnam as part of the overall settlement in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter sent to me by the State Department, together with my letter to the Secretary of State, and tables indicating the value and countries involved in this trade, may be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

one such expert has put it: "All the indications are that Peiping will only decide on direct military involvement if it believes that the United States has mounted a Yalu River-type escalation directly threatening the security of China itself." In a word, China's actual military posture in Vietnam remains essentially defensive. China's goal is to see the United States defeated by the Vietcong and to avoid itself being drawn directly into the conflict.

What in the past was based largely on educated guesswork can now be supported by an extremely significant, and largely un-noted, recent statement of China's Premier Chou En-lai. Chou, in a December 20 speech in Peiping celebrating the fifth anniversary of the founding of the National Liberation Front, outlined a number of actions the United States is preparing to take in Vietnam including the following: Bombing Haiphong and Hanoi; harassing and blockading the Bac Bo Gulf to cut the sea communications to Hanoi; bombing the Communist-held central and southern parts of Laos; dispatching United States, Thai, and Laotian Government troops to occupy this area; and instigating the Thai and South Vietnamese Governments to seal the border between Cambodia and South Vietnam.

Chou said nothing about possible Chinese responses to such action. Rather he said that if all these actions failed to save the United States from defeat in Vietnam, as he predicted they would, it is possible that the United States would "go a step further and extend its war of aggression to the whole of Indochina and to China." He strongly suggested that only at this point would China enter the war. Similarly, Foreign Minister Chen Yi, in a December 30 interview with a Japanese Communist correspondent, said in reply to a question about how China would cope with American escalation in Indochina: "If U.S. imperialism insists on extending the war to China, we cannot but resolutely take up the challenge and we will not call off the battle until complete victory."

Why should the Chinese tip their hand in this fashion? One reason might be a desire to draw the line sharply between what the United States can and cannot do in Vietnam so as to deter a premature U.S. attack on Chinese territory. Another might be to prepare the NLF for the failure of the Chinese to respond should the United States undertake the lower level actions mentioned by Chou. These actions, Chou implied, could be dealt with by the Vietnamese people themselves.

Obviously no one can be absolutely sure what U.S. actions in Vietnam might trigger a war with China. But available evidence suggests that Peiping is just as anxious to avoid a larger war as is the United States. Such a war, in which China would be extremely vulnerable to American air power, would serve no rational purpose either for China or the United States. This is not to say it could not happen. Nations have blundered into war before. The point is that both China and the United States have very strong reasons to avoid a direct confrontation in Vietnam and there is a reasonable chance that they can do so.

This does not mean that escalation carries no risk or is desirable. But it does suggest that the apocalyptic view taken by some administration critics is not appropriate to the situation. Moreover, this view hampers realistic consideration of American options.

THE MERRIMACK II STORY

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, it is an unhappy fact of life that every hair-brained scheme bearing the blessing of Government planners and bureaucrats receives front page attention,

regardless of merit or return to the taxpayer, while the contributions of private investment to the growth of our economy are accepted as a matter of course, with little notice and faint praise.

We are confronted with a classic example of this in northern New England where much has been made of a proposed hydroelectric project on the St. John River. In the midst of all the clamor attending this determined effort to bring public power to my section of the country, wanted or not, needed or not, economic or not, the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire is quietly proceeding with the construction of a \$37 million extension of its Bow, N.H., plant, designed to bring needed power to our State, at reduced cost to the consumer, without expense to the rest of the Nation, and with the payment of additional taxes to community and State.

As is pointed out in an excellent editorial appearing in the Manchester Union Leader for Friday, February 25, this provides a textbook lesson in the benefits of free enterprise as opposed to Government control, and I ask that the full editorial be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

I, for one, am delighted to help tell the "Merrimack II Story" and invite to the attention of the Senate that private initiative has not yet been stifled by big Government, at least in New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 25, 1966]

WHO WILL TELL THE MERRIMACK II STORY?

Construction of a \$35 million addition to the Public Service Co.'s generating plant in Bow, with an anticipated drop of between 30 and 40 percent in electricity bills, not only will provide a textbook lesson in the benefits of free enterprise as opposed to Government control, but also it will bring that lesson home with dramatic impact.

William C. Tallman, president of the firm, described this dramatic success story without need to resort to overstatement during his remarks at the recent ground-breaking ceremony. When the new addition—to be known as Merrimack II—becomes operational in the spring of 1968, Tallman said, New Hampshire will have the lowest electric power cost of any thermal unit in the six New England States. The 350,000-kilowatt unit at Bow will cause power costs to drop from 7½ to 4.9 mills per kilowatt-hour. Thus, in the short space of one decade, the cost will have dropped from more than a cent per kilowatt-hour to less than one-half a cent.

The addition to the existing plant, 6-year-old Merrimack I, will produce a total generating capacity of 478,000 kilowatts and also will result in the employment of hundreds of New Hampshire men at the construction site.

The company's investment is a commitment not only in terms of dollars and cents, it is also an affirmation of the Public Service Co.'s confidence in the future of the Granite State. To illustrate that confidence the firm is spending \$37 million on Merrimack II, the largest investment in a single factory ever made by a New Hampshire industry, and \$8 million for new transmission lines. Vice President Elliot Priest estimates that some \$11 million will be spent in New Hampshire for wages and materials for the construction project.

Out-of-State readers of this newspaper can breathe a sigh of relief. This is not a TVA-

type project. The lowering of electricity costs here is not being accomplished at the expense of the rest of the Nation.

Since all private utilities are watched closely by the Internal Revenue Service and are forbidden to deduct the cost of certain institutional advertisements from their taxable incomes—i.e., they may not indicate a preference for investor-owned utility companies as against Government-owned plants which are the beneficiaries of tax favoritism and vast public appropriations—it is to be hoped that New Hampshire's congressional delegation will use their positions to lavish the kind of praise on Merrimack II that is lavished on public power projects.

There's no law against that—so far.

FIRST LADY'S SPEECH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, on February 25, 1966, our First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, addressed the University of Alabama and American Association of University Women Leadership Conference at Tuscaloosa, Ala.

In returning to her native Alabama to speak at the university which she once attended, Mrs. Johnson alluded to the early history of the university and emphasized the role of women in the university's development.

Mrs. Johnson indicated several areas in national life in which women are making an outstanding contribution and correctly opined "when women get behind a project, things happen."

The First Lady did not confine her praise to the ladies. Indeed, she rightfully lauded Alabama's two distinguished U.S. Senators. No one knows better than their Senate colleagues how right Mrs. Lyndon Johnson was when she said "there are two men who stand tall in the Nation's Capital." I would like to identify myself with Mrs. Johnson's tribute to two of the Senate's most able Members.

The First Lady discussed, in an engaging manner, a number of the administration's programs. I call to my colleagues' attention this very interesting and charming speech of a very lovely lady.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Johnson's speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, TUSCALOOSA, ALA., FEBRUARY 25, 1966

Dr. Rose, friends, coming home is always a nostalgic experience and Alabama is second home to me. But my nostalgia is mixed with pride today as we gather at this great university. Back in the summer of 1931, I was enrolled here for 6 short weeks. Over the years, this campus has lived in my mind as the perfect setting for a college. It seemed to come right out of a novel, with all the romance and beauty that implies. I remember the patrician president's mansion and the quadrangle with its great old trees, offering welcomed shade and that comfortable feeling of deep roots. There was a marvelous swimming hole off the campus that must by now be lost to the forces of progress. But the center of life was the Union Building. We

than regret. It passed a resolution, the first of its kind, calling on him to reconsider. "The general welfare of the entire United States and Virginia demands his continued service," the resolution concluded.

Byrd, bearing his promise in mind, went to Mrs. Byrd with the assembly's request. She herself wrote a letter to the assembly: "I have looked forward to my husband's retirement, but I do not feel that my hope should obstruct the judgment of those better informed than I who think he can render a public service in these trying days."

So Byrd ran again for the U.S. Senate. His favorite corner there is the finance committee, of which he is chairman. He fights a cheerful but endless rearguard action against too much spending, too much foreign economic aid, too much intrusion by the Federal power. His arguments, in brief, almost offhand speeches, are never stilled.

Hundreds of major legislative actions in the fiscal field over the years have borne the imprint of Byrd's thrifty hand. The soundness of the social security system, for one, represents an enduring Byrd victory. From the enactment of the law in 1935, Byrd was dissatisfied with it, because it promised billions of dollars in pensions but offered no guaranteed means for paying the bill. He wanted nothing less than a pay-as-you-go plan—and 4 years later, in 1939, Congress accepted a Byrd amendment for pay as you go.

Seventeen years later, when the Eisenhower administration proposed the vast multibillion-dollar highway program now in the process of lacing this country, Byrd returned to the same principle. Eisenhower and George M. Humphrey, then Secretary of the Treasury, wanted to finance the system with a bond issue which would augment the already mountainous Federal debt. Byrd told them, "Roads, yes, gentlemen. Bonds, no, gentlemen." When the Federal Highway Act of 1956 was finally adopted, it carried Byrd's pay-as-you-go financing plan.

He fights doggedly even on small items. When in 1945 the time came for President Franklin D. Roosevelt's fourth inauguration, Byrd was chairman of the inaugural committee. Congress appropriated for the occasion \$25,000, to Byrd an ample sum. F.D.R., who had conducted polite but relentless warfare for years with the Senator, observed one night to friends: "Old Harry is so worried about money, I think I shall simply announce that I want nothing from him for the inauguration—not even his precious \$25,000."

Byrd calmly took the President at his word. He issued orders to the inaugural committee to return the \$25,000 to the Federal Treasury. Roosevelt paid for the chicken a la king inaugural luncheon out of regular White House funds.

Byrd has always assumed that because he means a thing when he says it, other public men mean what they say. Demagoguery is utterly foreign to him; he never hides his motives or apologizes for his actions. "I just go on my regular course," Byrd was quoted by Time. "I don't claim to have any special virtues at all. I just vote for what I think is right."

Truman once said that there were "too many Byrds" in the Senate. But there is only one Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia; and there will not soon, if ever, be another. Issues are endlessly debatable; but character is not. And Harry Byrd symbolizes a vanishing era of public men who stood to the end in awareness that their true and ultimate responsibility was to country and history.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, on behalf of the former senior Senator from Virginia, as well as on behalf of the present junior Senator from Virginia, I express my deep appreciation to the former colleagues of Senator Byrd

for the beautiful tributes that have been paid to him this morning, and for the magnificent plaque which was worded and approved by the Committee on Finance, on which he served so long as chairman.

Those Senators who served with him know how deeply he revered the Senate of the United States. I believe that all Senators know how much he misses the many wonderful and warm friendships he enjoyed for so many years with his colleagues in the Senate.

Speaking from my own point of view, it was an inspiring, wonderful thing today to sit in the Senate Chamber that he loved so much and to hear so many distinguished U.S. Senators pay to my father such wonderful tributes.

Madam President, on behalf of my father and myself, I express my deep appreciation.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, on February 23, when I introduced amendment 487 to S. 2962, to establish a Redwood National Park, I listed the following organizations which support amendment 487: Sierra Club, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the National Parks Association, the Federation of Western Outdoors Clubs, the Izaak Walton League, the Public Affairs Institute, Trout Unlimited, the Audubon Society, and Citizens for a Redwood Park. Amendment 487 is also supported by the Garden Club of America. The Garden Club of America went on record at a hearing before the Department of the Interior last November. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the statement at that November 22, 1965, hearing by Mrs. Thomas M. Waller, president of the Garden Club of America.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(For presentation at a meeting to review and discuss proposals for a Redwoods National Park in California—U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., November 22, 1965.)

I am Mrs. Thomas Waller of Bedford Hills, N.Y., president of the Garden Club of America, a national organization with member clubs from coast to coast and in Hawaii. I greatly appreciate this opportunity to present our views on this important issue.

The concern of the Garden Club of America for the Sequoia Sempervirens is a long serial which commenced in the 1920's. In 1931 we presented 2,552 acres on the south fork of the Eel River to the California State Park system and since then have added 1,565 acres to our grove. Our interest and concern for the preservation of the Redwoods has never lessened.

We strongly advocate the establishment now of a Redwoods National Park of approximately 90,000 acres, a park which would include about 45,000 acres of virgin trees, the most significant area of primeval redwoods, and other related natural features. In considering the total acreage to be encompassed in a Redwoods National Park we are mindful of the fact that the entire area was once a virgin forest of close to 2 million acres. We believe that Prairie Creek-Lost Man Creek-Redwood Creek Valley is the most important and suitable area for inclu-

sion in the National Park System. This contains the magnificent Gold Bluffs Seashore, with numerous waterfalls dropping down the face of Gold Bluff from the forest above, the unbelievably beautiful Fern Canyon, the world's tallest trees, and a far greater variety of scenic features than are found in any of the other proposed areas. The greatest variety of wildlife species, including the Roosevelt elk are to be found in this proposal and the area is especially important for its ecological value. It's recreational facilities are far better than those in the Del Norte County, for the magnificent Gold Bluff Beach would afford unequalled opportunities to the public for the enjoyment and use of a seashore area. In addition, the Prairie and Redwood Creek areas are better suited to absorb an increasing visitor load, without impairment, than are any of the other possible national park proposals.

Of greatest importance is the fact that the Prairie Creek-Lost Man Creek-Redwood Creek Valley contains a wider sweep of primeval redwood forest than is to be found in any other section of the redwood region; this sweep of forest extends from the near rain forest grooves in the present Prairie Creek State Park southeastward across the width of the redwood belt. Within this proposal there are also a number of unaltered tributary streams to Redwood Creek. These are practically the only streams in the redwood region today, the watersheds of which are still untouched by man.

With some 12,000 to 15,000 acres of the redwoods being logged each year it is the understatement of the century to say that time is of the essence. We urge establishment of a Redwood National Park of approximately 90,000 acres, believe the Prairie Creek-Lost Man Creek-Redwood Creek Valley to be the most desirable area for such a park, and pray that the first act of the next session of Congress will be to pass legislation creating a Redwoods National Park of this magnitude in northwest California.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, regarding the situation in Vietnam and the reasoned, careful escalation of American military activity there, I have said on several occasions that these are steps we must take, realizing the risk of provoking mainland China. Some critics of the Government's policies seem sure that we are bound to provoke China into massive intervention in Indochina. This, they say, is a risk we cannot take.

It is, however, a risk we must take. Today's Washington Post, Madam President, treats this question with an editorial which gives little weight to the apocalyptic view of the critics I have mentioned. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1966]
WAR WITH CHINA?

Many recent critics of American policy in Vietnam fear that this policy is increasing the risk of war with China. They expect early Chinese intervention in the Vietnamese war. There is reason to believe that their expectation is ill founded.

Some American specialists on China—familiar with her conduct in past crises—have long believed that she would intervene massively in the Vietnam war only if she were attacked or if American troops invaded North Vietnam with the intention of overthrowing the Communist regime there. As

March 8, 1966

interim coalition government into which the Vietcong could be incorporated along with the many other elements that make up the variegated political life of South Vietnam.

It goes without saying that the projected program of social reform emphasized at the recent Honolulu meeting is essential to any long-term solution in South Vietnam. If vigorously pursued, it would strengthen support for the Saigon Government and, in fact, aid it in negotiations with the Communists and in the inevitable postwar political conflict. But the trouble is that statements of South Vietnamese leaders give the impression that they have not much faith, or are not particularly interested in pushing this vital program. Such attitudes need drastic revision.

This newspaper believes that these modifications in present policy could conceivably lead to the beginning of a beginning of an end to the war. They may not work; but it is our belief that they offer a far greater hope of achieving an honorable peace and a far smaller risk of an "open ended" war than faces the embattled and bewildered American people today. The ultimate American objective must be to leave South Vietnam honorably and to leave it in condition freely to choose its own government and determine its own policy.

MERCHANT MARINE POLICY

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, a respected Member of Congress from Maryland, Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, delivered a speech on merchant marine policy at the end of last month before the Propeller Club of the Port of Washington.

Representative GARMATZ' speech pinpoints the needs of our declining merchant marine. It deserves to be called to the attention of the Senate.

I agree with Representative GARMATZ that the time is ripe for us to develop a realistic, positive, maritime program based on the framework of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

I also agree with Representative GARMATZ that such a program should include the second phase of our nuclear propelled commercial vessel development scheme. In general, shipbuilders need the same sort of assistance in vessel research that has already been granted to the aircraft industry.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Representative GARMATZ to the Propeller Club on February 23, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, DEMOCRAT, OF MARYLAND, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT THE PROPELLER CLUB, PORT OF WASHINGTON, LUNCHEON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1966, AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Clark, members of the Propeller Club, Port of Washington, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to appear before the Propeller Club of the Port of Washington.

The Propeller Club was founded to preserve the maritime heritage of our Nation and it is a symbol of our maritime industry and the American merchant marine. I am proud to say that I appear before you as a

member—for I have enjoyed membership in the Propeller Club.

It is something more than simply a very genuine pleasure for me to address you today.

The broadly based objectives of the Propeller Club of the United States to promote, further and support an American merchant marine adequate to meet the requirements of national security and economic welfare of the United States apply to all of the 50 member ports within and without the United States and to the 15 student ports. They are the objectives sought to be fostered by the more than 10,000 dedicated individuals who make up our national membership.

Interest in the furtherance of these objectives is at a high level in all of the constituent ports.

And I wish to compliment the national and local leadership that is presently exerting itself to make the Propeller Club an effective force in the vital maritime affairs of our country.

But there is something special about this club—not that there is any greater interest or dedication to our objectives than there is elsewhere.

The something special is due to the unique concentration of representatives here in Washington of virtually every element that goes to make up the great complex of American maritime policy and all of its contributing components.

Just a quick look at a roster of the membership of the Port of Washington bears this out.

From the Government you have many members from most of the executive departments, including, of course, the numerous bureaus and agencies within such departments.

You have vice presidents and other high officials of most of the leading shipping and shipbuilding companies.

The major maritime trade associations are well represented.

Maritime labor is widely represented.

There are naval architects, steamship agents, leading manufacturers' representatives, and lawyers galore. You have beautiful lady members, Madeleine Carroll and Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN.

So, it is a special privilege, and I believe very fitting, that I should appear before you today to make what is virtually my maiden speech since election to the chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am greatly pleased to see so many members of the committee here today.

I am looking forward to the coming years, and I am here to give you my pledge that I will do all in my power to carry out our national maritime policy and vigorously foster the objectives of the Propeller Club of the United States.

Although I have seen written reports that I am slanted in one way or another, I can promise you that my efforts will be directed in behalf of the overall good for the American merchant marine.

In my 18 years in Congress I have never witnessed a period when our national maritime policy has been the subject of so much uncertainty and confusion. Notwithstanding a clear statutory statement of policy, with a full set of implementing guidelines, we seem to be not only without a propeller, but apparently without rudder and helmsman as well.

At a time when the Soviet Union is expanding the size of its merchant fleet at a faster rate than any other nation in the world, the American merchant marine is experiencing a record decline.

I am concerned about the confusion and uncertainty that exists and I am concerned about the steady decline of this country as a maritime power.

It seems to me extremely shortsighted for this country to allow such a situation to exist and continue.

Our maritime industry should be a major and vibrant part of our economy—it is essential not only to our national defense—as the Vietnam conflict has once again proved—but to our commerce. If properly promoted, the merchant marine could by itself overcome our adverse balance of international payments.

Let us look at a few facts:

It is indeed ironic that the present budget calls for only 13 new vessels during the fiscal year 1966. In 1964, when 100 new merchant vessels were delivered to the Soviet Union, only 16 new vessels were delivered for U.S. registry.

A little over a year ago, the Soviet Union had 464 merchant vessels under contract in shipyards, including 111 tankers. As of the same date, the United States had only 39 new vessels under contract, including 1 tanker.

At the present time, the United States—the major power of the world and by far the world's major trading nation—ranks 12th in new vessel construction.

We rank behind such countries as Argentina, Brazil, Finland, and Peru.

For a nation whose growth and greatness have come from seapower, can these facts be other than alarming?

I have always considered that our basic maritime policy is sound.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, we have developed the world's most efficient and most modern liner fleet—even though inadequate in numbers. The detailed provisions of the act, however, have not been adequate to promote strong bulk carrier and tanker segments of our merchant marine.

Succeeding administrations have failed to seek the necessary implementing legislation or administer that which has been provided.

I would not attempt to contend that any statute, in the face of changing times, should remain unaltered for 30 years.

And we can have a more realistic program for assisting American-flag bulk carriers and tankers, without at the same time destroying that part of the act which has been successful. Some new legislation may be needed. Let us have it and we will act on it.

At a time when we should be considering a positive program for broadening the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to extend its benefits to all segments of the American merchant marine, we are floundering on the sea of uncertainty.

At a time when our domestic shipbuilding program should be at its peak, the present budget proposes a program that is the all-time low.

I am tired of reading analyses of the Interagency Maritime Task Force report, or of the report of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee. The business of our committee is legislation, and without a legislative program to consider, we are left to theorize like everyone else.

I am confident that President Johnson aims to dispel the atmosphere of despair that now prevails in our maritime program, as he has done in other areas. The picture is not entirely bleak.

Our country has the world's only nuclear-powered merchant vessel, the NS *Savannah*.

We are on the verge of technological breakthrough in the field of nuclear propelled commercial vessels, and the time is ripe for us to begin the second phase of our nuclear ship program.

The United States has the world's best, the most modern and most productive liner fleet—but we need more such vessels in private ownership to serve our complex society and the uncertain but demanding needs of war.

With assistance in vessel research similar to that of the American aircraft industry, I am convinced that our domestic shipyards could become competitive with foreign shipbuilders.

The Armed Forces, "The world has lost a distinguished citizen whose energies and vision were devoted without stint to a long lifetime of service to free men everywhere."

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Mar. 3, 1966]

HONOR RECIPOCATED

EDITOR, THE STAR-BULLETIN:

Last week the United States paused to honor the memory of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz. Many of us who had the privilege of serving under his command during World War II recalled anecdotes which illustrated the brilliance and simultaneously the humanity of his leadership.

One such anecdote stands out in my memory. It involves an incident here in Honolulu in the fall of 1945. An Hawaiian society, the Sons and Daughters of Hawaiian Warriors, decided to confer a rare honor on the famous admiral. They wanted to make him a "high ali" which honor had only been bestowed on one or two other haoles in recorded history. Admiral Nimitz was informed and replied that he would be pleased to accept the honor.

The ceremony was held on a Saturday morning and the locale was, naturally, the makai steps of Iolani Palace. Several thousand people, including representatives of many Hawaiian societies gathered to observe the impressive ceremony. After the conch shells were blown, an Hawaiian chant recited, two spears were crossed over the Admiral's head and the traditional yellow feathered cape was draped over the shoulders of his sparkling white dress uniform.

At that point, Admiral Nimitz responded in a fashion as exquisitely appropriate as I have ever witnessed. He accepted the honor in a brief speech in Hawaiian. In spite of what must have been crushing demands on his talents and energy, he had taken time to phrase and then memorize his remarks in Hawaii's own language.

You can imagine the reaction of the crowd. Deep emotion was openly expressed and I recall that many senior Hawaiian ladies and gentlemen wept without reserve.

Hawaii has honored Admiral Nimitz in many ways. On that day in October 1945, the admiral honored Hawaii with a simple yet profound gesture that was typical of his true greatness.

CHARLES G. BRADEN.

VIETNAM—WE ARE THERE

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate, and to the country as a whole, the editorial in the New York Times on Sunday, March 6, entitled "We Are There." It seems to me that this editorial states with unusual clarity and precision what many believe our objectives are, or should be, in Vietnam.

The editorial said:

The ultimate American objective must be to leave South Vietnam honorably and to leave it in condition freely to choose its own government and determine its own policy.

The editorial makes it clear, however, that it is not inconsistent with this objective to enter into direct talks with the Vietcong, and to make it plain that no one in South Vietnam would necessarily be excluded from participation in whatever interim government may be set up to precede the elections or in whatever government may be established after the elections depending, of course, on the outcome of the vote in honest elections. The editorial makes the point that the United States has moved quite

far toward accepting the necessity of taking such steps but the editorial goes on to note:

The American position has been obscured by crosscurrents emanating from various White House spokesmen, not to mention the South Vietnamese Government.

If I were to sum up the wisdom of this editorial it would be by pointing to the statement in the Times that "the fact remains that without compromise there can be no negotiation."

We must stand firm against any compromise that would mean accepting other than an honorable peace and would not establish the condition that would permit South Vietnam to choose its own government and determine its own policy. But this does not mean that we should deny reality for to do so would be to contradict our avowed desire to negotiate a settlement on this war. I believe that the New York Times editorial performs a great service in making these points clear.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 6, 1966]

WE ARE THERE

With the steady increase in the number of American troops in Vietnam—the figure is already 215,000 and will soon rise by another 20,000—there can no longer be much doubt that the United States is becoming committed to precisely what its civilian and military leaders have almost unanimously wanted to avoid: a massive land war on the continent of Asia.

Whether or not the figure will escalate to 400,000 or even to 600,000, as has been widely predicted—the fact is that already, as of today, "we are there"; and "we are there" on a scale and to a degree not even contemplated a relatively short time ago. The problem now is not to recriminate, but to see how and in what way the President can be aided in his profoundly serious search for peace—the peace that, as he said last week, "is within our grasp if we will both reach for it together."

While a strictly military victory in the normal sense of the word could, of course, be won by the United States over the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, the cost in escalation in human life, and in moral, physical, economic and political damage could invalidate such a victory even before it was won. Quite apart from the risk entailed in war with China, the picture of American obliterating an Asian country and people—even with the highest, most selfless of motives—is not a picture that would in the long run redound to the benefit of the United States nor to its long-range safety or interest.

It must be emphasized that the United States cannot and should not under present circumstances pull out of Vietnam. The United States, as the President has made clear, is not going to withdraw precipitously—or withdraw at all—without a satisfactory settlement. What this newspaper believes, and always has believed, is that constant military build-up is not the way to achieve such a settlement. Nor is it the way to accomplish the avowed purpose of the United States to transfer the conflict from battlefield to bargaining table.

If the non-Communist South Vietnamese are to have a fighting chance after the war, they must carry the main military burden

now. The immediate American objective should be to strengthen our allies but not to replace or supplant them, as escalation much beyond present levels threatens to do. A build-up to 400,000 American troops would over-Americanize what is essentially a Vietnamese political conflict, while bombing of the North Vietnamese cities of Hanoi and Haiphong—which thus far President Johnson has wisely refused to sanction—would also change the whole character of the war. This newspaper has, in fact, opposed and continues to oppose the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam on the grounds that, in terms of the purposes for which the United States is fighting, it does far more political and moral harm than military good.

In fact, this kind of choice is the essence of virtually all decisions affecting Vietnam: a balancing of risks, a determination of which of two unattractive courses is the less attractive, a selection not between what is clearly desirable and clearly undesirable, but between what is more or less undesirable.

While continued military pressure is purely essential if Hanoi and the Vietcong are ever to be persuaded to negotiate, there is an important difference between the approach suggested above and a steady escalation of the American military effort, which—despite protestations to the contrary—is what seems to be occurring.

The picture is not clear. There is no doubt that President Johnson has restrained the more belligerent of his advisers, and he deserves full credit for doing so; but it is also evident that he has not succeeded in making as plain as possible the limited nature of the American involvement.

The surest way to do this would be by a far more persuasive and consistent diplomatic and political offensive than has even yet been undertaken. We have not the slightest doubt that the President would infinitely prefer peace to war. Yet, neither the world—nor, even more strongly, the enemy—has been persuaded that the U.S. purpose in Vietnam is purely defensive; that Washington really means negotiations to be "unconditional"; that it would enter a resurrected Geneva Conference without prior conditions; that the United States really does not intend to keep on building up its forces in Vietnam to the maximum degree possible into an indefinite future.

While the attitude of Hanoi has thus far been totally negative and uncompromising, the fact remains that without compromise there can be no negotiation; and the United States should not be the party to this conflict that leaves any stone unturned in an honorable effort to achieve such negotiations.

For example, direct talks with the Vietcong are essential; and that fact should be frankly recognized despite the understandable aversion of the South Vietnamese Government to giving the immediate enemy even that much recognition. And it needs to be made even clearer that—as the White House has in fact suggested—the Communists would not necessarily be excluded from participation in whatever interim government may be set up to precede the elections; nor of the vote so warrants, from whatever government may be established after the elections.

In recent weeks the United States seems to have moved quite far toward accepting such a possibility; but the American position has been obscured by crosscurrents emanating from various White House spokesmen, not to mention the South Vietnamese Government. It is obviously not to America's interest to weaken the South Vietnamese Government; at the same time, however, steady pressure must be applied on General Ky and his colleagues to open up a dialog with civilian political groups and to envisage the ultimate establishment of contact with the Vietcong, looking toward an

March 8, 1966

5040

fied, HARTKE occupied a seat behind committee members.

In the Senate, HARTKE also made a series of speeches warning against escalation of the war, emphasizing the threat of a land war with China and calling for a U.S. military holding action in Vietnam.

Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, describes HARTKE as "a kind of catalyst" who brought together the group of like-minded Senators who have "misgivings about the war."

"He put it together," says METCALF. "He saw the opportunity to assert some leadership and to advance something he sincerely believed. It's about time Senators started exercising leadership."

Another Senator credits HARTKE with welding the peace group from members who had merely been expressing scattered concern about Vietnam policy.

"He hits head on," the Senator says. "He's not afraid to take a single position. He's a person of independent judgment, energy, and drive. He's concerned more with achievement—to unify the group—than in making a personal record."

By sticking his neck out, isn't HARTKE risking a complete break with the White House? "I don't think this has made any difference," answers a Senator. "If anything, he's gained recognition. This man downtown just looks at power."

In any event, HARTKE, in his 8th year in the Senate, has fashioned a new power base to be reckoned with.

LONG-LINE COMMERCIAL FISHING IN THE OCEANS

Mr. BREWSTER, Madam President, I recently read an article in Sports Illustrated that brought to my attention a potential crisis in the world's oceans.

This article, written by Martin Kane, a senior editor of Sports Illustrated, points out that if the technique of commercial fishing called long-lining is allowed to continue unregulated, the world population of big game fish may be seriously diminished.

This problem deserves the attention of every supporter of conservation.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the January 31, 1966, issue of Sports Illustrated entitled "Plenty of Fish in the Sea?" be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article in the January 28, 1966, issue of Time on the same subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLENTY OF FISH IN THE SEA?

(By Martin Kane)

The world population of big game fishes—most notably swordfish, the marlins, sailfish and the various tunas—is threatened with early decimation. A technique of commercial fishing that is centuries old but has been applied on a large scale only recently is ravaging the oceans. It is called long-lining, and it is the subject of dismayed denunciation in every big game fishing port on the coastal perimeter of the United States, throughout the Caribbean, along the coast of Mexico, in Scandinavia, Australia, and New Zealand. It has sparked skirmishes between sport and commercial fishermen. It has alarmed marine scientists, most of whom concede its devastating effects as a matter of commonsense but urgently need funds to establish scientifically the precise extent of the harm it has done to fish populations at

ready and what its continued untrammeled use portends. Objective of the research: international controls. To many a salt water angler the prospect that such controls can be instituted in time is dim.

Robert S. Nyburg, a Baltimore sport fisherman and advertising man who specializes in billfish, fears that "there may be no more [salt water] sport fishing in this country" by 1970. (If you think striped bass are a sport fish, Nyburg does not know you. He thinks in terms of bigger game.) "There is a real and present danger," Nyburg says, "that, unless some fast action is taken, there will be no more marlin, sailfish, giant tuna or broadbill fishing on either coast of the United States in a very few years."

At least equally alarmed is Ed Louys, executive secretary and director of the Caribbean Gamefishing Association.

"Soon there will be no fishing in the Caribbean," he said recently in Miami. "Commercial fishermen themselves told me this in Venezuela, in Trinidad, in Jamaica—that, unless restrictions are placed on this fishing, they will be destroyed. Since the long-lining thing came out we have been answering questions from hundreds of people asking what we should do, what can we do, to prevent overfishing."

Gerald Talbert, head of the Tiburon (Calif.) Marine Laboratory of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, believes that since the Japanese are by far the most extensive users of long-lining, "our only hope is to appeal to the basic good nature and sense of fair play among the Japanese people. If properly approached," he says, "I believe they would understand and withdraw from the sport-fishing area. So far as I know, no official protest has ever been entered."

Though there are others who hold that the only effective recourse would be a threat of economic sanctions in areas other than fishing, Talbert's view is by no means naive. The Japanese have been singularly cooperative in game-fish tagging programs aimed at understanding and eventual conservation of the fish involved and are more aware than any other national fishery of the excessive efficiency of long-lining. But they do need enormous quantities of fish to supply the protein requirements of their national diet, as do many island peoples. To pose the importance of recreational fishing against this need may be difficult, but there is more to it than that. While long-line fishing has been profitable for them, their catches have begun to thin out under long-lining pressure and they might well be amenable to international controls if these were to be proposed with sound scientific backing.

Unfortunately, sound scientific backing does not exist. If sufficient research grants were available immediately, it might take 5 years or more to put together a persuasive argument of solid scientific validity. In 5 years, many sport fishermen believe, the whole matter may be tragically academic.

Long-lining is as simple as it is ancient. Tie a line to the handle of a glass jug, add a hook and bait to the line and toss the jug over the side. As the jug drifts free, the bait will attract a fish. When a fish is hooked it pulls against the resistance of the jug and seemingly tries to drag it under. The jug always wins. The fish is inevitably exhausted. The fisherman recovers the jug and hauls in the fish.

Multiply that single hook by thousands and the glass jug by hundreds of glass-ball floats, all connected by surface lines that, strung together, may extend 10 miles or more, and you have long-lining, the deadliest method of ocean fishing ever devised.

The long-line's basic unit, called a "basket" because the line is coiled into baskets on deck, is a main line about 300 yards long, buoyed to the surface by float lines. Branch lines, to which baited hooks are attached, extend down into the water at variable

depths. About 10 hooks are used for every 300 yards or so of main line. Baskets are connected one to another until a length of 10 miles or more may be reached. A drift in a current, such a line has the effect of a wide broom sweeping the sea.

Tuna constitute 85 percent of the Japanese catch in Pacific waters, the remaining 15 percent being billfish. The boats put out individually and in fleets, some accompanied by a mother ship, abroad which the catch is processed and canned. There is one major fishing firm which operates 2 mother ships and 112 catcher boats, each of them long-lining. At 10 miles to a line, though actually some lines are shorter, these 112 boats would represent 1,120 miles of fishing line in simultaneous operation.

Long-lining can deplete the sea itself. It has done just that in the Indian Ocean, which is the world's third largest and second deepest sea. Long-lining so drained it of yellowfin tuna—the catch dropped from 12 fish per 100 hooks set to about 5 per 100—that the Japanese all but quit fishing for them there. They switched to marlin and sailfish and in 1956 began to concentrate on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in ever-widening scope. Now the Japanese seem to be fishing themselves out of the Atlantic. With declining catches there, half the Japanese Atlantic fleet has been ordered back to Japan. The bankruptcy inherent in long-lining is being seen in the Pacific, too. According to the Sport Fishing Institute in Washington, "Marlin harvests by Japanese long-liners fishing off the Pacific coast of Central America" were poor in 1965—only three or four fish per boat, compared with catches of hundreds per boat in 1964. Average weight per fish was about two-thirds of what it used to be, a fact confirmed by sport fishermen, who note that along the Pacific coast marlin once averaged 110 pounds and now are down to 60 or 70 pounds. Mexican resort owners, largely dependent on sport fishermen, are in a state of panic.

The Sport Fishing Institute, which is largely supported by tackle manufacturers and provides research grants for scientific institutions, observed in its November Bulletin that "bluefin tuna stocks in the Atlantic Ocean also may soon be in trouble." Not just long-lining but purse-seining threatens the Atlantic tuna population, to such an extent that O. V. Wells, Deputy Director-General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, said last summer that "the rational utilization of tuna resources in the Atlantic Ocean requires urgent international attention." During 1962, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found, U.S. fishermen landed a mere 40,000 pounds of tuna at Middle Atlantic ports. Two years later the U.S. figure had jumped to 6 million pounds, and the fishery had become so attractive that purse seiners were moving in from as far away as the Pacific coast.

The Japanese are by no means the only long-liners. The Norwegians are in the Atlantic, off the U.S. coast, concentrating on sharks but getting a share of swordfish and other gamsters, too. Swedish sportsmen are decrying the fact that long-lining has begun to affect their salmon catch. Canada has some 250 vessels in the summer and 25 in the winter long-lining the Atlantic for swordfish, once taken mostly by harpoon as they loiled on the surface. The U.S. fishery has a score or so of long-lining vessels in the Atlantic, and these have been averaging 300 swordfish a trip during the peak fall season. Red China is long-lining, but no one knows to what extent, and the same is true of the U.S.S.R., which has just announced a new 5-year plan aimed at increasing its catch more than 50 percent. Cubans are long-lining for marlin. And the Spanish are at it, too.

But all these, separately and together, are minuscule in comparison with the Japanese operation. Its growth from 1956 to 1963 was

March 8, 1966

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIEWPOINTS: AN INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS

(NOTE.—A member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging since June 1963, Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, heads its Joint Subcommittee on Long-Term Care for the Elderly, which has held comprehensive hearings on nursing home problems and national needs in both institutional and non-institutional services. He is chairman of the subcommittee on housing and a member of its panels on retirement income and health of the elderly. The 54-year-old native of Halladay, Utah, holds the degree of Juris Doctor from George Washington University Law School in Washington, D.C. He served for 10 years as city judge in Salt Lake City and for 8 years as county attorney for Salt Lake County before election to the Senate in 1958. Now in his second term, Senator MOSS serves on the Small Business, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works Committees in addition to the Aging Committee.)

NURSING HOME BEDS AND MEDICARE

Question. You have said people are over-estimating the effect medicare will have on the nursing home field. Why?

Senator MOSS. Medicare is a hospital-oriented program primarily concerned with acute, short-term illness. The crucial point is that payment for care in nonhospital facilities under medicare is not for the purpose of financing conventional nursing home care but for the purpose of economizing on hospital facilities.

Thus, those nursing homes which will be providers of services under medicare will be those that wish to offer a comparatively short-term, intensive service and to enter into arrangements with hospitals to serve, in effect, as extensions of those hospitals. This is not the major or usual service of most nursing homes and it probably will be a minor phase of the nursing home business. I think there is a danger in thinking that medicare's extended care benefit represents a bonanza to the nursing home field.

Question. Isn't it true that there is a shortage of nursing home beds?

Senator MOSS. We hear a lot about that. Of course, there are shortages in some localities. There is also a need to replace some facilities that are hopelessly substandard. However, sometimes what may appear to be a nursing home shortage in a given community may actually be, in large part, a shortage of alternative services for elderly people who need some care. And our subcommittee has received testimony that an excess of beds has been built in certain areas.

Question. Which ones?

Senator MOSS. In major cities of the Midwest and West, such as Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, and Los Angeles. In my own State, Utah, figures indicate there may be a short-run surplus.

There's a paradox for you: a much publicized shortage and yet new facilities experience low occupancy and frantic competition for survival.

Question. Why this overbuilding?

Senator MOSS. Testimony suggests that some of it has resulted from speculative building in anticipation of State's implementing the Kerr-Mills law for medical assistance for the aged. This mistake might be repeated on an even larger scale if people widely suppose that medicare will support a considerable addition to the current inventory of nursing home beds.

There are indications this may be happening. I have been told that small business investment companies, supported by the Small Business Administration, have had many applications for loans to build

nursing homes to meet the supposed demands of medicare. SBIC officials report that many applicants have not even read the law and don't know medicare details. Another bit of evidence: business opportunity pages of newspapers advertise to speculators in nursing care. For instance, an ad in the New York Times said this: "Be ready for medicare—motel suitable for conversion to a nursing home." I know of large corporations that are considering diversifying into the nursing home field to cash in on medicare.

Question. If what you say about overbuilding is true, won't that leave us with competition among providers of care? Won't such a situation improve the nursing home field?

Senator MOSS. I don't think a surplus of nursing homes produces a healthful competition. Rather, it produces a situation in which nursing homes have great difficulty in meeting basic needs of their patients from the revenues which they can derive.

Question. What do you think will be the positive effects of medicare on the nursing home field?

Senator MOSS. Medicare pays on the basis of reasonable cost. This represents the first time that this principle has been applied federally for nursing home care. Despite the limited role for nursing homes in medicare, the program represents an opportunity to show what the costs actually are when the services demanded by the public are provided. I hope we may be able to adopt this principle for all public programs dealing with nursing home care. This would bolster the economic base for the progress and improvement all of us would like to see.

Nursing homes, potentially, are centers where knowledge and techniques to promote self-care and independence in daily living can be applied. This care must be financed realistically for patients under public programs. In this session of Congress, I plan to introduce legislation to assist nursing homes and other institutions in servicing the chronically ill and aged patient.

HARTKE KEY ROLE IN VIET TALKS IS REVEALED

Mr. BURDICK. Madam President, in the last few months our colleague, Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, has played an important role in contributing to the national debate over our policy in Vietnam.

Although not a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has contributed as much as any Member to the debate in this Chamber which all of us have witnessed these past weeks. He has made excellent speeches on his own and has persuaded others to join the debate and offer their solutions to the Vietnam crisis. A recent issue of the Evansville Press from Senator HARTKE's home State of Indiana had an excellent article describing his activities in recent weeks.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTKE ROLE IN VIET TALKS IS REVEALED (By John V. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Just before last Thanksgiving, the paths of Senators VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, crossed in Hawaii.

HARTKE was starting a round-the-world

trip with a Senate delegation for foreign policy discussions in Japan, India, and Pakistan.

FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was en route to a parliamentary conference in New Zealand.

Both Senators had long been troubled over the grinding war in Vietnam and the ever-present threat that it could spark a nuclear battle and a land war with Red China.

As HARTKE recalls the chance meeting, FULBRIGHT repeated his desire to conduct open hearings on Vietnam by his committee and his inability to get them going.

"I told him I'd help him," HARTKE says. "I knew there was great sentiment in the Senate for a debate."

If one event can be singled out as the starting point of the great debate on Vietnam, it may well have been this discussion thousands of miles from the Senate Chamber.

When HARTKE returned from his month-long trip, he was even more convinced of the need for a complete airing of U.S. involvement in Vietnam, U.S. objectives, and U.S. efforts toward ending the war.

HARTKE found little support for U.S. presence in Vietnam. And he came back thoroughly disgusted with the costly foreign aid program.

"VANCE came back from the trip with strong feelings," recalls Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, a member of the group that some are calling "loves."

HARTKE returned as President Johnson halted bombing of North Vietnam and launched his peace offensive.

From a series of meetings in FULBRIGHT'S and HARTKE'S offices and informal cloakroom discussions came the outlines of the Foreign Relations Committee hearings and floor debate.

HARTKE participated in preparing the list of committee witnesses (although he is not on FULBRIGHT'S committee) and in scheduling the floor speeches.

Toward the end of January, after the peace offensive had got no place, it became apparent that Johnson would order bombing of North Vietnam resumed.

HARTKE, and other Senators who feared what escalation of the war might lead to, decided to appeal to the President to continue the lull in bombing while pursuing peace efforts.

HARTKE had a letter to Johnson drafted—the author HARTKE won't name—and circulated it among a handful of Senators for their comments.

Some thought it "too conciliatory, too polite."

A request that Johnson "consult" with the Senators before resuming the bombing was softened to the wording: "We believe you should have our collective judgment before you, when you make your decision."

And this sentence was added: "We believe we understand in some small degree the agony you must suffer when called upon by our constitutional system to make judgments which may involve war or peace."

The letter was dispatched to the White House less than 24 hours after a late-evening meeting in FULBRIGHT'S office, at which HARTKE agreed to round up other signatures.

After a talk with Vermont's GEORGE Aiken, senior Republican in the Senate, HARTKE agreed to ask only Democrats to sign the letter.

It went to the White House with 15 signatures. Johnson reacted with a curt reply, and 4 days later bombing of North Vietnam targets was resumed.

In February, FULBRIGHT'S committee aired opposing viewpoints on Vietnam strategy, and the Senate Chamber reverberated with debate over Johnson's policies.

HARTKE, according to a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, worked on procedural questions arising in the hearings. The day Secretary of State Dean Rusk testi-

March 8, 1966

agencies and from the Consumers Advocacy Council.

In a special message to Congress on February 5, 1964, President Johnson stated that his new Consumer Committee would effectuate action "against the selfish minority who defraud and deceive consumers." The President further stated:

America's economy centers on the consumer. The consumer buys in the marketplace nearly two-thirds of our gross national product—\$380 billion out of an output of \$600 billion * * *. Yet, for far too long, the little weight in government * * *. My special assistant, and the new Consumer Committee will lead an intensified campaign * * * to fight side by side with enlightened business leadership and consumer organizations, against the selfish minority who defraud and deceive consumers, charge unfair prices, or engage in other sharp practices.

Hearings on the Hart-Celler bill to require truth-in-packaging have shown us that informed judgments are often made difficult or impossible by deceptive or confusing packaging and labeling. The shopper ought to be able to tell at a glance what is in the package, how much of it there is, and how much it costs. We do not seek monotonous conformity. We do seek packages that are easily understood and compared with respect to sizes, weights, and degrees of fill * * *. More clear-cut regulations are needed to deal effectively with the problem of misleading adjectives; fractional variations in weight which are designed to confuse; illustrations which have no relationship to the contents of the package.

The consumer credit system has helped the American economy to grow and prosper * * *. The antiquated legal doctrine "Let the buyer beware" should be superseded by the doctrine "Let the seller make full disclosure." I recommend enactment of legislation requiring lenders and extenders of credit to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amount of their commitment and the annual rate of interest they will be required to pay.

The chief truth-in-lending bill is S. 2275, submitted by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, a bill on which hearings have been held since 1960 before the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Numerous similar bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives, but there has been no committee action on any of them as of this date.

The purpose of this legislation is to require anyone who extends credit or lends money to supply the borrower or credit-user with a statement of the total finance charge in dollars and cents and with a statement of the finance charge expressed in terms of a true annual rate on the outstanding unpaid balance of the obligation.

This represents no attempt to regulate the rate of interest or the cost of credit, but is a disclosure measure that would allow the typical consumer to compare the cost of credit from various sources and make an intelligent decision. Such information would help him to decide whether or not to borrow, pay cash, or save toward the purchase instead.

As Senator DOUGLAS so succinctly phrased it:

We would apply the same conditions to those who sell the use of money as we re-

quire from those who sell goods. We expect the seller of breakfast food to at least state the quantity and the price on the package. We expect the butcher to list the price per pound for the meat he sells. We expect the gasoline dealer to disclose the price per gallon he charges for gasoline. We expect food stores to post the price for milk per quart at the retail level. Why should not we expect the lender or credit extender to post his price in a similar fashion?

In the hearings on truth-in-lending bills, the committee members have literally been shocked to find consumers paying over 100 percent, sometimes over 200 percent, rates of interest for appliances or automobiles. Most commonly, the true interest in cases brought before them ran in the 60 to 70 percent bracket, what with padding and fictitious fees added on. The committees have also found a link between the underworld and the growing loan-shark racket, and the ultimate conclusions of many Congressmen have been that the present system coddles the unethical who would be driven out of business by more honest dealers if disclosure legislation were passed.

Senator DOUGLAS has stated that his truth-in-lending bill will enable the consumer to shop intelligently for the best credit deal since all the facts must be presented. Thereby, the lowest interest-rate dealers would get more business and the consumer would have more money to spend on other things. It is unfortunate that the poor and the minority groups are the most preyed upon by certain types of businessmen, but legislation like this would not only protect the consumer but also the ethical businessman who loses out to the unscrupulous competitors.

In the words of Senator DOUGLAS once again:

Basically, the question is whether we want truth to prevail in the marketplace. Men often fear truth, but ultimately it is beneficial and healing. It rewards the ethical and deters the careless and less ethical. In the end it benefits all but the determined and conscious wrongdoers.

Truth-in-packaging legislation similarly has been introduced in the 87th, 88th, and 89th Congress. S. 985 introduced in 1965 by Senator PHILIP HART Democrat of Michigan, is the prototype of this legislation which deals with "trade and commercial practices affecting consumers in a manner which tends to restrain competition in interstate and foreign commerce, with particular reference to deceptive, misleading, fraudulent, or unfair practices in the production, processing, packaging, labeling, branding, advertising, statement of prices, and other conditions of sale, marketing, and furnishing of goods and services to consumers."

More than a dozen truth-in-packaging bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives, spearheaded by Chairman EMANUEL Celler, of the Judiciary Committee.

The main thrust of these bills is to make it easier for the purchaser to compare prices on similar products, not to impose conformity on packaging as claimed by opponents. Hearings have been held and completed on S. 985, and

I hope that this measure will come before the Senate for debate soon.

Both of these pieces of legislation are of vital concern to me because of their importance to the American consumer. It seems to me only simple justice that the borrower be informed of the full interest rate on his loan or credit purchase, just as it is eminently fair that the manufacturer clearly state the true content and weight of his packaged goods. Basic issues of honesty are involved, as well as an affirmation of the principle of business competition through a fair disclosure of what the consumer is getting for his money. Truth-in-packaging and truth-in-lending bills are promulgated on very basic American principles: the right of the consumer to know what he is buying and the obligation of the businessman to disclose what he is selling. I believe that these measures deserve the support of all fair-thinking Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this vitally needed legislation.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BAKALAR AIR FORCE BASE, COLUMBUS, IND.

(Mr. HAMILTON (at the request of Mr. REES) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the House an increased combat readiness posture which has been attained by the 931st Troop Carrier Group at Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Ind.

This Air Force Reserve Group has earned a C-1 rating, the highest assigned to our tactical units.

Attaining this high proficiency under normal circumstances is commendable. This dedicated group increased its combat capabilities to the highest status, however, in the face of a Defense Department announcement that it was to be deactivated.

I think this is outstanding and deserving of special note.

Reflected in this achievement is the superior dedication of all members of this reserve unit and the civil service workers—the civilians—who perform most of the maintenance and administrative chores for the reservists.

And, in view of the Vietnam situation and continued tensions elsewhere in the world, I am deeply concerned that the Defense Department phaseout orders, aimed at this highly proficient group and seven others across the country, have not been reviewed.

These groups represent an airlift capacity that could be utilized—indeed badly needed—in the delivery of supplies, men and equipment. Aircraft from these units now are flying missions on a volunteer basis to Newfoundland, Bermuda, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, and within the United States.

This volunteer effort is helping to offset a callup of the Reserves. The airlift is being accomplished at a cost of about one-tenth the cost if a Reserve callup is required.

The 434th Wing at Bakalar Air Force Base, also scheduled for phaseout, has accrued an outstanding flying safety record with the C-119 aircraft. The men of the wing have flown over 106,000 hours over the last 9 years—without an aircraft accident. This is the highest record within all of Tactical Air Command—considering active, National Guard and Reserve units.

The 434th is truly a capable, combat-ready Reserve unit. Again, I believe its planned phaseout should be reviewed.

AN OPEN LETTER TO VIETCONG SYMPATHIZERS

(Mr. JOELSON (at the request of Mr. REES) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now inserting in the RECORD my open letter which I hope, but doubt, will influence some sympathizers of the Vietcong in the United States:

DEAR MR. X: I have received your recent letter in which you have opposed our Vietnam involvement and expressed some sympathy and support for Hanoi and the National Liberation Front.

I wish to make it abundantly clear at the outset that I do not at all equate opposition to our Vietnam policy with pro-Communist sentiments. I am not now discussing the validity of our Vietnam policy. I am only addressing myself to that vocal minority among the critics of our position who seek to justify the actions of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

Frankly, Mr. X, you puzzle me. I am curious to know what makes you tick. You and others like you consider yourselves free and untrammelled spirits. Therefore, you dissent, you write letters to your Congressmen, you picket, you demonstrate. Has it now occurred to you that in the type of a society which you support, such persons as you would be among the first to be liquidated?

You must have read that recently in the Soviet Union, two writers who suggested that all was not well over there were sentenced to many years of hard labor in a prison work farm. Even as I write to you, they are probably being driven to exhaustion and collapse, felling trees in the frigid forests of the Soviet Eden. In Communist China, those free spirits who criticize the state are treated more mercifully. For the crime of "individualism," they are killed outright.

You have written to me, a member of the Federal Establishment, saying that our national policy is inhuman and suggesting that justice and decency reside with the adversary. Have you thought what would happen to someone who dispatched such a communication to a government official in Hanoi or Peking?

It is strange indeed that some dissenting nonconformists who could not survive in the political climate of communism seem to yearn for such a climate. Perhaps it is a subconscious wish for punishment, but I have no wish to be punished with you.

Because I venerate the right of dissent which you so freely exercise, and because I feel it vital to the viability of a democratic society that such right be protected, I shun the type of a system which you have attempted to justify.

So, Mr. X, you go right on protesting, writing letters and demonstrating. For my part, I shall try my best to support those

polices which I think are best designed to protect you against your own blind folly.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. JOELSON,
Member of Congress.

MINIMUM WAGE FOR FARMWORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in order to pressure Congress against legislating a minimum wage for farmworkers, the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation is issuing a leaflet extolling the glories of child labor. The leaflet, "Steve's Job Is in Jeopardy," describes the possibility that a 13-year-old child might not work in agriculture if a minimum wage is extended to large farms.

The leaflet is simply incredible. One would think these arguments went out with the 19th century.

The leaflet also complains because H.R. 10518 would ban the use of children under 12 years of age in agriculture.

The leaflet neglects to mention that H.R. 10518 provides that full-time students may be worked at 85 percent of the minimum wage. Since the bill provides an initial agricultural minimum wage of \$1.15 an hour, the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation is arguing against a minimum of 98 cents an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member will read the leaflet of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation. I can see no better reason for covering farmworkers under the Fair Labor Standards Act than the arguments made in this fantastic leaflet for excluding them.

I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the leaflet, "Steve's Job Is in Jeopardy," printed in the RECORD.

STEVE'S JOB IS IN JEOPARDY: THIS IS WHAT YOU CAN DO

WHY?

The smiling, freckle-faced boy on the front of this folder is Steve Stapleton, age 13, of 605 Johnson NE., Salem, Ore. Steve is an important part of the work force in

the Willamette Valley. Steve, like thousands of other youngsters, works a few weeks each summer harvesting Oregon's pole bean and berry crops. Steve helps with the picking because he is needed, because he wants to and likes to, but, most of all he helps because it gives him the opportunity to earn his own money.

But Steve may have to enter the ranks of the unemployable. That is, unless you who believe Steve should have the opportunity to work do something about it.

It isn't that Steve can't work or doesn't want to work, nor is it that the farmer no longer wishes to hire him.

Steve, along with thousands of other youngsters, may be legislated out of his job.

H.R. 10518

H.R. 10518 is the number of a bill in Congress which would prohibit the hiring of any youngster under 12 years of age, and those over 12 who were permitted to work would have to be guaranteed a minimum wage for each hour worked.

Some may say, "What's wrong with that?" Well, you see, Steve has never been employed on an hourly basis. He works on a piece-rate basis. In strawberries he gets paid so much per carrier; with beans, so much per pound.

He gets paid for what he does. Steve likes it this way. It lets him set his own pace and his own hours. If he wants to leave the field and go practice ball, he can do it. The harder he works, the more his pay.

But the bill before Congress makes no provisions for those who work on a piece-rate basis. Every youngster who came to the field would have to be guaranteed a minimum wage of \$1.15 an hour, regardless of what he produced.

The plain, simple fact is that the farmer cannot afford to hire Steve and his friends if he has to guarantee all of them \$1.15 an hour.

And if the farmer cannot afford to hire Steve and his friends, then he cannot stay in the berry business. Steve and his friends are out of a job and the berry grower is out of business.

OTHERS ARE INVOLVED

There are more people than Steve and the farmer involved. What about the people who work processing and canning the beans and berries? What about the merchant downtown where Steve and his friends spend their earnings?

The following table shows what these crops contribute to Oregon's economy:

Importance of pole beans and berries, Oregon, 1964

Crop	Acres	Production	Farm value (thousands)	Value added by processing (thousands)	Processed value
Pole beans.....	9,500	186,400	\$10,380	\$21,060	\$31,440,000
Strawberries.....	15,500	2100,800	14,447	14,650	20,097,000
Red raspberries.....	2,700	212,960	1,957
Black raspberries.....	2,600	24,160	1,165
Tame blackberries.....	3,800	223,100	3,765
Boysenberries and youngberries.....	1,150	23,795	676
Loganberries.....	420	21,080	286
Total, caneberries.....	10,370	245,695	7,840	6,825	14,674,000
Total.....	35,370	32,676	39,125	75,211,000

1 Tons.

2 1,000 pounds.

Source: Compiled from economic information for 1964 production furnished by Oregon State University.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

It's hard to believe Congress would intentionally legislate Steve and his friends out of a job. But unless we let our congressional delegation in Washington, D.C., know we think it is important that Steve and boys

and girls like him should have the opportunity to work and earn, it could happen.

You are urged to wire or write each Member of Oregon's congressional delegation and urge them to vigorously oppose any legislation which would restrict the opportunity for the employment of our youth.

March 8, 1966

A1286

and Applications' Prospectus 1965, listing program opportunities for 1966-85—in a draft dated June 10, 1965. The prospectus is based on two possible situations: a constant budget—called the minimal growth program—and a 5-percent-a-year increase above this. Note: the AOSO was still in the NASA program at the time the working group made its recommendations.

1. The Aerobee sounding rocket program should continue to receive full support, with highest priority given to the development of triaxially stabilized rocket attitude controls. (The working group pointed out that Britain has successfully flown three solar-pointed Skylark rockets, placing them ahead of the United States in one branch of solar research.) Other improvements, such as increased payloads, peak altitudes, increased reliability and more dependable recovery techniques, should be made in existing rocket systems. The number of rockets available per year for research in solar astronomy should be at least doubled (25 to 40 Aerobee-150 rockets will be needed each year from now until 1975). Funds for payload development should be increased to an adequate level.

2. The presently approved Orbiting Solar Observatory (OSO) program should be augmented by at least four additional launchings during the 1970-72 period. No decision should be made to terminate OSO after 1972 without further review at an appropriate time. NASA should make every effort to improve OSO, i.e., increased power, offset pointing, localized raster scans, provision for slightly longer instruments, greater data capacity and more flexible format, and improved pointing accuracy. Consideration should be given to injection of one or more OSO craft into a polar retrograde orbit.

3. The Advanced Orbiting Solar Observatory (AOSO) is an indispensable next step in NASA's solar program and must be flown close to the coming solar maximum. The working group said AOSO cannot be replaced during the 1970-75 period. (Since the report, the AOSO has been terminated by NASA. See Space Daily, Dec. 16, Jan. 21, and Jan. 25).

4. Manned missions in the 1968-72 time period, such as the Astronomical Telescope Orientation Mount (ATOM) in AA, are desirable to supplement AOSO, but cannot replace it. (See Space Daily, Jan. 24, 25, and 26.) Nonetheless, the ATOM concept merits vigorous support.

5. Solar space observations should be included in the manned space science program of the AA program.

6. Feasibility and design studies should begin immediately on solar telescopes to follow AOSO. These Manned Orbiting Telescopes (MOT) should have at least a 1-meter aperture designed to obtain a resolution of 0.1 seconds of arc at visible wavelengths and 0.5 seconds of arc at far ultraviolet wavelengths. Erection, operation and maintenance of this telescope will require full utilization of astronaut-engineers and scientists.

7. Provisions should be made for a continuing, uninterrupted experimental program while the more advanced manned flights are in preparation, with many flights of various spacecraft, so that a scientist will have frequent opportunities for observation.

8. NASA should find means to continue a strong program with relatively inexpensive rockets and small unmanned satellites at the same time the large manned projects are underway.

9. When a single, large scientific instrument is carried on a manned space flight, scientific observations should be designated the primary mission for the flight.

10. NASA should bring more scientists into the spaceflight program as astronauts or observers.

11. NASA should move to provide additional support for ground-based solar studies. This would include a few major ground-based solar installations.

12. Increased support should be given to physical research in the laboratory as required to develop improved space instrumentation for solar physics research, to assist in data reduction, and to make possible a full interpretation of the results. Lyman Spitzer, Princeton University Observatory was chairman of the Working Group of Optical Astronomy; and Leo Goldberg, Harvard University, headed the Working Group on Solar Astronomy.

NAS RECOMMENDS SPACE-ASTRONOMY PROGRAM—II

In addition to examination of the areas of optical astronomy and solar astronomy (Space Daily, Feb. 2), working groups of the Space Science Board's Woods Hole, Mass., study considered these other programs in the general classification of astronomy.

Radio and radar astronomy

The following recommendations cover major instrumental and observational advances which should take place over the next 15 years.

1. The Radio Astronomy Explorer (RAE) satellite series should be continued and expanded. At peak rate, launches of at least 1 a year will be needed. Leadtimes for approval of programs for RAE must be reduced. Two RAE satellites should be flown near sunspot maximum.

2. The National Academy of Sciences should appoint a panel to study possible conceptions of a space radio telescope with an aperture of 20 kilometers to initiate studies of the scientific and engineering problems connected with its construction.

3. Work should start now on a high-resolution, broad-band antenna system for radio-astronomical observations (in connection with No. 2). The antenna could be a possible payload for AA (Apollo Applications).

4. The exploitation of millimeter-wave and far infrared observing capabilities from ground-based, aircraft-borne, and balloon-borne facilities should be encouraged and supported by NASA.

5. NASA should make studies of the technology, feasibility, and cost of building space telescopes with apertures of 100 feet. Launching and maintenance of such a telescope could possibly be a part of AA.

6. NASA should vigorously support ground-based radar astronomy studies.

7. NASA should include in the Voyager series planetary orbiters containing a swept or multifrequency radar system to detect and measure any planetary ionosphere. The first Voyager to approach Jupiter should carry instruments designed to study the planets magnetosphere, ionosphere, and atmosphere.

8. NASA should include in the Voyager series investigations by means of bistatic radar systems with one element of the radar on Earth and the other on the probe. A similar experiment where the probe is occulted by the planet is recommended for study of planetary atmospheres and ionospheres.

9. Lunar orbiter missions should be used by NASA to test instruments suggested for Nos. 7 and 8, as well as for gathering data on the moon. These missions would again be possible payloads for AA.

10. A substantial extension of existing radio and radar observations of the solar corona and interplanetary medium is recommended. Suitable interplanetary probes (RAE) would be launched in conjunction with ground stations. The ground-based equipment should be regarded as a national facility and its construction given high priority.

11. NASA should devote a much larger fraction of its resources to the construction of ground-based deep-space telecommunications terminals, with the objective of increasing the amount of information that will be returned from solar and planetary spacecraft now proposed.

As for the question of the use of the lunar for radio and radar astronomy, the working group stated: "From a strictly scientific point of view, despite the possible attraction of the back of the moon as an interference-free site, all the future plans that the group considered appeared to be more easily and better done in orbit than on the moon."

Solar radio and radar astronomy

1. A substantial extension in existing radio and radar observations of the sun should be made. Large, new, versatile instruments, to be regarded as a national facility, should be constructed. The national facility should be given highest priority so that observation may be started during the coming sunspot maximum.

2. A series of solar RAE satellites should be flown during the sunspot maximum, to provide data on low-frequency characteristics of solar radio bursts.

Remarks of President John W. Oswald to Members of the Kentucky General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the University of Kentucky, my alma mater, recently concluded its centennial year. During that time its board and faculty conceived a new academic plan, a program which is attracting the attention of leading American educators.

The other day, as the centennial year ended, members of the Kentucky General Assembly were guests of the university. Dr. Oswald, the dynamic president of the University of Kentucky, spoke to them and outlined the academic plan and other events of the year. I believe his message has real value to Kentuckians especially and to the academic community in general.

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT JOHN W. OSWALD, TO MEMBERS OF THE KENTUCKY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

We are coming now to the close of an enjoyable day, and a busy day. I would like, however, to take a few more minutes of your time to share with you some of our hopes and dreams here at the university.

As you know, 1965 was our centennial year, the celebration of our 100th birthday. It has been a great year here on the campus and at our community colleges. And, by the same token, I hope and believe that our Commonwealth has shared in those triumphs, both major and minor.

During the past 52 weeks the leadership of the world of politics, the world of commerce and industry, and the academic world—that leadership has made its way to the Lexington campus—and the buildings of our community colleges.

The President of the United States joined us to speed us into our second century of

March 8, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1285

to own property of their choice, and most important, to cast a free vote—to provide guidance to that small number of our youth who have decided against even a secondary education—to provide equal rights to job training and mobility to the unfortunates who are deprived of livelihood in areas subjected to economic starvation—and yes, even to preserve the right of the motorist driving on interstate highways to scan the horizon without the blemish of a road sign. Each of these issues deals in some measure with the dignity and the rights of the individual.

But what about one of the remaining segments of that circle of individual rights and dignities—that circle which intends to encompass the Great Society? This would be the inventive, competitive entrepreneur, supplying the Government directly or indirectly; who wishes to provide for his own healthy long life and sustenance; who wants to create his own technology at his own expense, and to be able to protect it as private property from invasion by others; who wants to operate freely in a competitive society with the inherent risks related thereto but without the inhibiting regulatory roadblocks created to control those who invent for and are subsidized by the Government. Where is the long-hoped-for legislative action to protect the individual rights of this self-sustaining segment of our society?

Have you heard of any legislation restoring the rights of a patent holder to assert a claim of infringement against the infringer rather than the Government—where the Government has encouraged infringement through contractual protection of the infringer? No—you haven't—even though several bills have been drafted in the House and Senate during the last two sessions of Congress—none of which have been reported out of committee.

Have you heard of any change in approach by the General Accounting Office—even after a special hearing was conducted in the House on the very subject? No—you haven't.

Have you noticed any lessening in the implementation of public laws dealing with costs, pricing, audits and the like beyond that intended by Congress—particularly as such implementation flows down to the smaller, fixed-price private developer? No—you haven't—except for Mr. McNamara's recent statement of concern over the survival of this private developer.

We would suggest that much of the legislative action during this last session was directed toward the Government's providing for and protecting the rights of those who, in today's society, have difficulty in doing so themselves—which is as it should be. Is it paradoxical, then, to suggest that similar action might be taken to provide for and protect the individual rights of the inventive entrepreneur from invasion by this same Government?

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Congressional Chartering of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week commemorates the 50th anniversary of the congressional chartering of the Boy Scouts of America. We salute the members of this organization and their leaders who have contributed so greatly to

the growth of America's leaders and potential leaders.

Fifty years of progressive guidance for our young people through the Boy Scouts has produced a tradition measured not only within the boundaries of America but throughout the world.

In Syracuse and Onondaga County, N.Y., there are thousands of young boys who are taught honor to God and country. Within this nationwide organization our young realize the satisfaction of responsibility and the pride of hard work and achievement. They progress within the bounds of capable leadership. They realize the satisfaction of fellowship and the pleasure of solitude. Within the Boy Scouts is the gift of brotherhood.

Offers a Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Constitution believes that President Johnson's renewed plea for peace in Vietnam "goes further than any of his previous utterances."

The paper points out that the President has called for honest negotiations and self-determination for South Vietnam, and has offered massive aid for a reconstruction program in both North and South Vietnam.

The paper states:

Once more the President puts the struggle in Vietnam in proper perspective.

In the belief that many of my colleagues will want to read this article, I insert it in the RECORD:

PRESIDENT OFFERS A CHOICE

President Johnson's renewed plea for peace in Vietnam goes further than any of his previous utterances. In a ceremony marking the fifth anniversary of the Peace Corps, the President invited leaders of North Vietnam to negotiate peace "and let war stand aside while the people of Vietnam choose."

Pointing out a fact that must be known to Hanoi's leaders, the President declared that victory is beyond expectation for them. He thus calls for honest negotiations and self-determination for South Vietnam, offering massive aid for a reconstruction program in both North and South Vietnam.

After peace and freedom of choice are established in the south, the President declared, "all the people of Vietnam can freely express their will on the great questions of unification and national destiny."

The President again made it quite clear that the United States has no aspirations of conquest or of imposing its will on the Vietnamese people. He made it equally clear that we will not retreat from our ordeal of war, which the North Vietnamese cannot win. Our desire for peace springs not from weakness or hesitation, he said, but from a "recognition . . . that the search for peace requires great skill and great courage."

Once more the President puts the struggle in Vietnam in proper perspective. We will not abandon South Vietnam to aggression and terror but are willing to negotiate an honorable end to the conflict and to leave it to both North and South Vietnam to seek their own destinies.

Report on Space Planning—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, this is the second of four summaries of a report by the National Academy of Sciences on recommended future space activities.

NAS RECOMMENDS SPACE-ASTRONOMY PROGRAM—I

An increased effort on such programs as the now canceled AOSO program (Space Daily, Dec. 16), ATOM (Space Daily, Jan. 24), LOT and MOT has been recommended by the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences in part II of its report, "Space Research: Directions for the Future." (See Space Daily, Jan. 17 and 19 for part I of the report.)

The report was prepared by a working group of scientists, under the direction of George P. Woollard, University of Hawaii, which convened last summer at Woods Hole, Mass. The report was prepared at the request of NASA. Space Agency contributors to the report included Dr. Homer Newell, Associate Administrator for Space Science and Applications, and William B. Taylor, Director of the Apollo Applications Office.

Optical astronomy

The following recommendations were made regarding a short-range program, covering the period 1965-75.

1. The number of coarse-pointing sounding rockets available each year for optical space astronomy should be doubled from the present level. A fine-pointing system for Aerobee rockets should be made generally available as soon as feasible.

2. Two or more telescopes having apertures of 40 inches or larger should be included in the Apollo applications (AA) program. The Orbiting Astronomical Observatory (OAO) program should be continued until AA launchings are definitely scheduled. Recommended experiments: High-resolution imaging; infrared photometry and spectro-photometry with cryogenics; planetary spectroscopy in the ultraviolet; polarization and photometry; X-rays.

3. Development of various detectors required in space telescopes should be supported by NASA. These include infrared devices, image-registering devices using solid-state detection, new photographic emulsions, cryogenic apparatus, and television techniques for astronomical use.

4. Development of improved gratings and echelles, especially for ultraviolet work.

5. Development of optical interferometers should be pressed, with probably initial operation on the ground.

6. R. & D. concerned with problems of space-telescope optics, especially with the primary mirror, should be supported by NASA.

7. Support of ground-based astronomy should be increased.

8. Studies toward development of a large orbiting telescope (LOT), which would be used after 1975, should be undertaken. The space telescope would have a resolution corresponding to an aperture of at least 120 inches. Man may play an important role for LOT. AA could be an important forerunner of the manned high-resolution LOT.

Solar astronomy

The working group considered the time period 1965-80 and made recommendations for specific experiments that might be initiated in three periods 1965-70, 1970-75, and beyond 1975. (The group said its study was based on the NAS report of the Space Science

tion to the cultural life of the community in sponsoring the exhibition of Mr. Lew-andowski's stimulating work.

No Justification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I filed legislation to reverse the Customs Bureau's recent adoption of new guidelines for the appraisal of imported rubber-soled canvas footwear. At that time, I pointed out that the Customs Bureau's action constituted a drastic reduction of the tariff traditionally applied to these goods, and that this reduction posed a serious threat to the economic prosperity of the domestic footwear industry. A recent editorial appearing in the February 25, 1966, issue of the Naugatuck News summarized the concern of the many residents of my congressional district who depend upon the continued vitality of this domestic industry for their livelihood, and I have unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record for the consideration of my colleagues.

NO JUSTIFICATION

We are quite pleased with the proposed legislation filed by Congressman JOHN MONAGAN to correct the "highly discriminatory" action of the Customs Bureau when that agency recently lowered tariffs on rubber-soled canvas footwear.

The Monagan bill would reestablish the Presidential proclamation of 1933, which set tariffs on such products at the high cost of American production (now approximately \$2.65 per pair). The new guidelines established by the Customs Bureau this past month would base tariffs on the lowest of domestic production (about 90 cents). Obviously, the new tariff is based upon a much cheaper shoe than is produced by most of the leading manufacturers of rubber-soled canvas footwear.

We doubt if the Customs Bureau can justify the recent action which was taken. Economically it doesn't make sense. The move will throw American workers out of jobs in order that workers in foreign countries will be employed. It is obviously a political favor for a few importers of foreign-made products—all at the expense of the American workingman and American industry.

In taking the action, the Customs Bureau ignored the pleas of union and management officials as well as the advice of other Federal agencies. We seriously question the motives of Customs Bureau officials.

Even under the \$2.65 base, the imports of foreign made rubber-soled canvas footwear has increased from 40,000 pair in 1954 to 21 million pair in 1965. A fantastic rise during an 11 year period.

What will happen now? The floodgates are open. One would suspect that the Customs Bureau has made it a goal to destroy the rubber footwear industry in this country.

Noting the figures which show the fantastic increase in competing foreign-made products, one would think consideration would be given to raising tariff barriers, not lowering them.

It is appalling to us to note, that the Customs Bureau has not been collecting the tariffs on rubber-soled canvas footwear for the past 3 years—and now wants to make the 90-cent base retroactive to February 4, 1963, when evaluations on such products were suspended.

As Congressman MONAGAN put it, "Now, after postponing the importers' obligation to pay any tariffs for 3 years, the Bureau is retroactively reducing the tariff which has accrued during that period. In view of the large Federal revenue loss involved." Congressman MONAGAN feels the matter deserves more study. We feel a full investigation is called for.

Previously, the Customs Bureau reduced tariffs on rubber overshoes under similar circumstances. Statistics reveal that in 1955 only 185,412 pairs of waterproof footwear were imported from foreign countries. But by 1963, when the duties were lower, the level had advanced to more than 12.8 million—and, it is somewhat higher now.

We call upon the entire Connecticut congressional delegation to take up the fight. Not just Naugatuck stands to suffer, but the life of an entire American industry is at stake.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce into the Record of today's proceedings a great essay. These inspiring words were written by Miss Linda A. Gowing, of Bellevue, Wash. With them she won the top award for the State of Washington in the voice-of-democracy contest sponsored in our State and nationwide by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary.

We, and all Americans, could profit by reading this young lady's definition of democracy.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

(By Linda A. Gowing)

A young girl stared into the barren hills of Letcher County, Ky. She embraced the cracked figurine of a Madonna and child. Her life: a void. Who am I?

An Argentine farmer walked his dead land. He pulled from the earth a rusted stalk of wheat. His fields: a wasteland. Why am I here?

A Negro boy struggled to recite the Pledge of Allegiance. Nigger, nigger. His status: subhuman. Where am I going?

"And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the earth and breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living being."

Living beings, all of them. And what has democracy created for each? The answer: Identity, a sense of worth, integrity.

The young girl today wears shoes; she can print her name, and sing "America, the Beautiful," she is a child of God.

The South American farmer plants his crops in irrigated land. His children have bread—and his children have laughter. He has found a place, a purpose.

The Negro boy is learning the meaning of the words, "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Democracy does that. It is a spirit, a thing that breathes, a fire sometimes, but it is vital. And it is very specific.

To the young girl, democracy becomes a pair of shoes, and a government that cared enough to extend its concern to the welfare of her family.

To the farmer, democracy became the Peace Corps, and a man who puts the power of his heart into the strength of his hands.

And to the Negro boy, democracy became the simple gesture of standing among white children, hand to his heart, pledging "liberty and justice for all."

All three of these human beings are the beneficiaries of democracy.

How then do I participate in democracy? How do I assess it? How define? And what is the prospect for my generation?

Here's my answer. Democracy is not measured in antiballistic missiles, nor world marketing computers, nor even in man's conquest of the outer universe. It is now power, nor wealth, nor triumph. My democracy is measured not by things, but instead, by complex and simple—ever fallible human beings. Generations are made up of those people. I am as fallible as the next—as hopeful—as fearful. My generation, though, is going to be that government that puts shoes on the Kentucky girl. My generation is going to be the compassionate hand of the Peace Corps in Argentina. We will be also the soldier, the Rabbi, the mother. So we take our part, invent our personal share.

Democracy is a working thing. And it is a pretty down-to-earth thing. I'm involved in it, too, as all of us are. We're already a part of it. Killer diseases, racial conflict, international tensions, the population explosion. These issues are very specific too.

And we shall meet them. I am making an investment in democracy. I am committed by birth, circumstances, volition, and pride. Multiply this by the hundreds of thousands of high school students across this country—and you see the future is proud, clear, and triumphant.

Inflation, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the concern of our people over the inflationary trend of our economy has been increasing for the past several months.

The sharp rise in prices, the additional costs of the war in Vietnam, and the restoration of some excise taxes are but a few of the factors that are giving impetus to this deep concern.

Just yesterday we were all shocked to see the stock market take its worse loss since November 1963.

Recently the newspapers in my district have frequently discussed this situation, and I insert at this point in the Record their comments on the present situation.

From the Bristol (Tenn.) Herald Courier, Feb. 24, 1966]

A DOLLAR'S VALUE

"How Real Is Inflation in the U.S.?"

That is the title of an article in the January 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report. It is accompanied by a full-page chart which makes informative, and woeful, reading.

Assume that the 1955 dollar was worth 100 cents. On that basis, your present food dollar has lost 15 cents in value; your rent dollar 13 cents; your home-building dollar 20 cents; your college-cost dollar 24 cents; your auto

by next year we will be well on the way to establishing such an institute.

Sincerely,

EDWARD W. D. NORTON, M. D.,
Professor and Chairman Department of
Ophthalmology.

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF HOUSING AND
DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR,
New York, N.Y., March 2, 1966.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERB: I have read the bill proposing a National Eye Institute which you are planning to cosponsor with Representative ROONEY, of Pennsylvania.

I think the bill is great. However, I have two comments:

1. Are the necessary funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this bill, and
2. I believe that somebody from our organization should be included as a member of the Advisory Council, if consonant with section 452A, as set forth in the bill.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL Z. NELSON,
Deputy Coordinator of Housing and
Development.

THE MOUNT SINAI HOSPITAL,
New York, N.Y., March 2, 1966.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TENZER: There are many cogent reasons for the establishment of a National Eye Institute and I do feel that the Fight for Sight and National Council to Combat Blindness should support this vigorously.

Sincerely yours,

IRVING H. LEOPOLD, M.D.

WOODMERE, N.Y.,
March 2, 1966.

CONGRESSMAN HERBERT TENZER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TENZER: I am in full support to Congressman FRED B. ROONEY's (Pennsylvania) proposal to establish a National Eye Institute.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR A. GOLD, M.D.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 2, 1966.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HERB: Thanks for your enclosures on H.R. 12373. I can see the need for a separate institute; but I also see inherent dangers. The public wants eye diseases cured and prevented. The optometrists want greater status—and this bill will offer them an opportunity to attain that by wasting millions on so-called vision research. I am for this bill if it is emphasized in the bill that the prevention and cure of blindness is the chief goal of the Institute.

Sincerely,

DAN M. GORDON, M.D.

HARRY MOSS JEWELER,
New York, N.Y., March 3, 1966.

CONGRESSMAN HERBERT TENZER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERB: I have just returned from a lengthy trip, and I was pleasantly surprised to have received your letter advising me of the intention to open a National Eye Institute. Certainly, I am all for it.

In my position as national vice president of Fight for Sight, we have always urged what you have outlined in your proposed bill.

A National Eye Institute has long been needed and will help countless upon countless of thousands. Had there been a National Eye Institute my sight might have been saved.

You have my complete support, and if there is anything further I can do to help pass this measure please do not hesitate to call on me.

I trust you are enjoying good health, and I am looking forward to seeing you in the very near future.

Kind regards,

HARRY MOSS.

Mr. Speaker, the support for the bill is to establish a National Eye Institute, illustrated by the correspondence which I have quoted above, is encouraging and should be considered by the Congress. The need for a new program to assist the fight against blinding eye diseases is clear and I urged my colleagues to join this effort to establish a National Eye Institute.

One Citizen's View on Southeast Asia Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to the editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal. The letter, written by Rabbi Jacob H. Epstein, is an excellent presentation of one citizen's views on U.S. policy in southeast Asia. I considered it thought provoking and believed that other Members of Congress would enjoy the opportunity to read it:

To the HERALD-JOURNAL:

Although we can sympathize with the humanitarian impulses of the church and other groups who vehemently protest the involvement and escalation of the war in Vietnam by the United States, yet it is nevertheless noteworthy the lack of comprehension evinced by these groups as to the true nature of this conflict.

By now it should be quite clear that South Vietnam is being used as a testing ground by the Red Chinese for their militant ideology. It makes little difference if it's Ho Chi Minh or another Chinese puppet who is in power and mus; bow to the Chinese masters, we know that it is the determination of the Red Chinese to prove to the entire world that the West is weak and disunited and cannot stand up against the overwhelming forces of Communist revolution.

In its ideological struggle with Soviet Russia, the Red Chinese also want to prove that such terms as coexistence and mutual understanding with the West are sheer nonsense. Therefore, any means within reason can be used to further the objectives of the school of militant Red Chinese communism.

It matters little if millions of people will perish as a result. To the Red Chinese human life is the most expendable item in their program for global conquest. If a country loses its inhabitants through war, then the Red Chinese can always pour in their hordes to fill the gap.

America is today the only country in the entire world that is making a real stand

against communism. Even its former allies for whom she gave so much are deserting her. It is therefore tragic to note that Americans act so dissident and cause disunity.

Whenever protest marches take place and national leaders vent their opposition, the Red Chinese gloat. Their propaganda organs blow up every act of protest to impress the Chinese people that America is weak and disunited.

Really, what I fail to understand is why it has suddenly become so fashionable to protest loudly. If I recall during the Second World War when millions of people were sent to their fiery graves by the most brutal murders ever perpetrated, nary a protest was heard. In 1959, when Red China plunged into Tibet and hundreds of thousands of innocent people were ruthlessly murdered, little protest was heard. When the Egyptian Dictator Nasser sent 60,000 Egyptian troops to Yemen, and they massacred thousands of Arabs, I did not see any picketing of the Egyptian Embassy. No pipsqueak students have protested against the Chinese penetration into many other countries. And pray what are Red Chinese advisers doing in Syria? It seems that only the United States can do wrong by sending its troops to fight communism. Ruthless war by other people is perfectly permissible.

Perhaps these groups do not realize that if the United States should ever retreat in Vietnam and the Red Chinese gain their coveted victory, it will only mark the beginning of a far bloodier and costlier series of conflicts. As with the evil Hitler whenever he won a victory, it only whetted his enormous appetite until he tried to swallow the entire world.

If instead of being dissident, we would show determination to back our Government, our enemies might be brought to their senses and realize that their militancy will not prevail. Only then can the Red Chinese warlords order the North Vietnamese to end the conflict. I doubt that the Red Chinese will remain intransigent in the face of real American unity. These Reds may be ruthless but they have probably studied some history and even they would not dare plunge this whole globe into a war of annihilation.

Rabbi Jacob H. Epstein.

A Polish-American Art Exhibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1966, I was pleased to attend an exhibition of the art of Bernard Lewandowski, sponsored by the Polish-American Youth Association of Passaic, N.J.

The artist who created the impressive paintings now resides in Passaic. He was born in Poland, and studied at the Krakow Academy of Fine Arts until the war. Leaving Poland in 1945, he studied in Paris, and after 18 years in France he came to the United States. His works can be found in many private collections, and also in museums in his native land.

I am proud to have an artist of Mr. Lewandowski's stature in the congressional district which I represent, and I compliment the Polish-American Youth Association of Passaic for its contribu-

March 8, 1966

major savings. And one thing is sure—the taxpayers whose money the department saves have no kick coming.

South Bend Comes Out From Under

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the text of a thoughtful and perceptive article which describes the extraordinary comeback of the city of South Bend, in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, from the shutdown of the Studebaker plant there over 2 years ago.

The article, which appears in the February 19, 1966, issue of Business Week follows:

SOUTH BEND COMES OUT FROM UNDER

Two years ago, Studebaker Corp. moved its auto production from South Bend, Ind., to Canada, wiping out a \$45-million annual payroll and 8 percent of the city's jobs. Government agencies rushed emergency aid. Panicky citizens wondered when—if ever—South Bend could recover from the loss of its major employer.

Today South Bend, though scarred by its experience, is in excellent economic health. Its unemployment rate is less than 2.5 percent. Its major problem is a labor shortage. United Auto Workers representative James D. Hill barely remembers the days when he served up his shoulders for workers to weep on. Representative JOHN BRADEMÁS, Democrat of Indiana, says he hasn't received a job-hunting letter in months.

I. AID FACTORS

In great part, this amazing recovery stems from boom times, rather than from specific attempts to alleviate the effects of the Studebaker shutdown. But experts say in retrospect that emergency measures by Government and private agencies also helped in varying degrees. And they feel there is much to be learned from the South Bend experience, one of the most publicized and analyzed plant closings in U.S. history.

The No. 1 conclusion is that the publicity itself benefited South Bend. Doom-laden predictions roused public sympathy and—with an assist from the district's Congressmen and Senators—brought all-out action from the Johnson administration. In quick succession:

The Agriculture Department loosened income restrictions to permit distribution of surplus food to 1,500 families.

The Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration sent representatives to urge postponement of hasty mortgage foreclosures.

The Small Business Administration stepped up regional activities.

Several agencies set up an area procurement conference to teach local businesses how to bid on Federal contracts.

South Bend was declared a surplus labor area, giving it prime consideration for Government contracts.

The Labor Department's Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, in cooperation with the National Council on Aging, created a job hunt and assistance program called Project Able (ability based on long experience).

Some \$4 million in Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) funds poured into the area.

How it worked

An experimental interagency committee created under the Area Redevelopment Administration conducted liaison among the various groups. On it sat representatives of Studebaker, the UAW, and Federal agencies. Harold L. Sheppard, of the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research served as coordinator.

Some projects paid off. Others didn't. The FHA and VA pleas to postpone mortgage foreclosures turned out to be unnecessary. Few Studebaker workers were that close to financial rock bottom. Most companies ignored the procurement conference and SBA programs. The surplus labor area designation had more effect outside South Bend than in it.

Project Able and the MDTA, however, were judged unqualified successes.

Operation

Project Able used a staff of 15 and a budget of \$330,000 to serve 3,500 workers over the age of 50. Staff members prepared resumes, got in touch with 1,800 employers, arranged 2,600 job interviews, cranked out propaganda on hiring older workers, and counseled out-of-practice job hunters on how to groom for and behave during interviews. The UAW, Studebaker, and closer to home, and finally in South Bend itself.

Settling down

The first blue collar jobs found after the shutdown were in auto plants in Chicago and Indianapolis, where groups of Studebaker workers rented apartments for Monday-to-Friday use. Then the mobile home industry boomed in Elkhart, 20 miles away; Project Able made most of its earliest placements there.

Then heavy steel mill construction generated jobs in Burns Harbor, and mounting steel production set off a kind of relay race headed for Gary 70 miles away: workers in Michigan City, halfway between South Bend and Gary, left their jobs for the high-pay Gary jobs, and South Bend workers moved into the vacated Michigan City jobs.

Then the hiring wheels started turning again at Bendix Corp., U.S. Rubber Co., and other South Bend area plants, and the Studebaker workers came home.

II. IMPACT

In all, some 500 Studebaker alumni moved away permanently, according to Frank J. Fahey, Notre Dame sociologist retained by the interagency committee to study the shutdown's aftermath. Most of these were management people, many from out of town, or skilled workers. Only a handful of unskilled workers left despite State employment service offers to pay half the moving expenses and provide liberal loans.

Studebaker workers who have failed to find steady jobs number 316. "They work for short periods, sometimes take county relief, have relatives helping out," says Julius C. Gravelle of the older workers relocation project.

In general, the company's workers turned out to have been relatively well prepared for the shutdown—possibly because the auto industry's seasonal layoffs had accustomed them to rainy days. About 27 percent moonlighted (compared to a national average of 5 percent), 34 percent had working spouses, and 35 percent had nonwage sources of income such as dividends or veterans' benefits. About 72 percent had money in the bank before the shutdown, and 65 percent still had it 6 months later. Only 3 percent were forced to return items purchased on credit.

Perhaps the attitude toward credit would have been different—and the impact on South Bend retailers sharper—if the work force had been younger, Fahey speculates.

Studebaker suppliers, too, had long since diversified. No business went under. In fact, at its worst—9.1 percent—South Bend's post-Studebaker unemployment rate was nowhere near the 19 percent of 1954. South Bend's real crisis came during the recession of the 1950's, according to the Reverend Edward Keller, a Notre Dame economist.

Assessment

Father Keller argues that the "bad work habits" bred by Studebaker's cost-plus contracts of World War II discouraged new industry from coming to South Bend, while the ups and downs of auto employment undermined community confidence. He contends that the change came when a new Studebaker management improved work habits, setting a citywide pattern. Now, he says, Studebaker's replacement by diversified industry—together with the confidence-building effect of working together to weather the storm—has completed South Bend's rehabilitation.

Not everyone, of course, sees the shutdown as an unmixed blessing, even in disguise. South Bend now has a higher percentage of nondurable goods manufacturing and service industries. This means that workers earn less. The tax base is down by \$10 million. Some Studebaker workers had to give up retirement plans because they are too old to qualify for pensions on their new jobs. Many employees are working beneath their skills. Some skilled workers have left permanently.

On balance, however, the conclusion appears to be that, although there were casualties, the full-scale, intelligent use of Government and private resources—bolstered by a burgeoning economy—have enabled South Bend to wrest victory from defeat.

School Milk Program and the School Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, budget proposals to curtail funds for the school milk program and the school lunch program have alarmed parents and school administrators all across this Nation.

The views on this subject of Thomas J. Farley, the director of the school lunch program in Wisconsin's largest city, probably are representative of administrators all over this country.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Farley's recent letter to me in the RECORD:

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 2, 1966.

The Honorable JOHN RACE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: As director of the school lunch department of the city of Milwaukee public schools, I am concerned at the pending legislation designed to cut back appropriations relating to the Federal school lunch program.

The proposed legislation seems to spring from a mistaken concept that the school lunch program is intended chiefly for indigent people. It definitely is not. It is intended for all our people. Children from all economic strata benefit by the Federal lunch program. The proposed reduction in appropriations will benefit only those with higher

fully honored in this country, the President cautioned:

"We are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also are we united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness."

As a result of President Johnson's signal explanatory effort, Peiping and Hanoi now stand warned that "wars of liberation" against countries to whose defense the United States is committed are no short cut to world domination.

firm and dedicated friends of the moral standards which are the real strength of any nation and its citizens. Let us salute them during the forthcoming week—and let us all help their cause in any way we can.

Choice Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, in a timely editorial the Washington Post makes it clear that passage of the supplemental appropriation for the Vietnam war by overwhelming votes in both branches of Congress ought to make it clear that there is no obstruction to the prosecution of foreign policy.

The Post believes this "ought to help countries that do not follow democratic practices to understand our system." It adds that the administration and Congress "have chosen a hard course—and with understandable anguish. They have chosen it because they recognize that the only alternative course might be even harder."

Because of its forthright comments, the article is submitted for inclusion in the Record:

THE HARD CHOICE

Passage of the \$4.8 billion supplemental appropriation for the Vietnam war, by overwhelming votes in both branches of Congress, ought to make it clear, at home and abroad, that dissent in Congress is no obstruction to the prosecution of foreign policy.

The combination of a great deal of opposition talk and a very few opposition votes puts the situation in exactly the right dimension. It ought to help countries that do not follow democratic practices to understand our system. If North Vietnam was misled by the angry words in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on the Senate floor and in the House, it ought to see the situation more clearly now.

The five votes to rescind the Tonkin Gulf resolution give a fair measure of the importance of Senate opposition to the President's policy in the terms of practical action. Nothing could more clearly show North Vietnam that Washington in 1966 is not Paris in 1954. What the North Vietnamese confront in South Vietnam is not the foreign legion of a tottering parliamentary regime, on the edge of political chaos and in the midst of postwar reorganization. They face the Armed Forces of a strong American Government, in full political control, back by immense financial and military resources and supported by a people who are not demoralized, disorganized, or disaffected.

This is not to say that either Congress or the country likes this distant conflict over difficult issues. Many are unhappy and distressed, not only by the jeopardy in which Americans must act, but also by the hardship of war that they must inflict upon others. A people indifferent to these anguishing considerations would be devoid of heart or mercy or compassion. The anguish of the Nation was reflected in the speeches in Congress. And it is an anguish of which Senators and Congressmen have no monopoly. There is no delight of battle anywhere in this country.

Government that is capable of making an intelligent choice between a good course and a bad course is not unique in the world. There even have been many capable of choosing wisely between two good courses. The highest test of government is the capacity to choose wisely from available courses when every course presents its difficulties, dangers and hardships and sacrifices. And that is the kind of choice that the administration has had to make and that the Congress has had to make.

They have chosen a hard course—and with understandable anguish. They have chosen it because they recognized that the only alternative course might be even harder. They have embraced the known risks of today, because those risks, however formidable, seem smaller than the risks that would confront us tomorrow were we to seek an easy escape from present danger. This is not the kind of choice that is accompanied by cheers and shouting—but the courage and wisdom to make such a choice is the mark of a stable, mature, and resolute government that cannot be easily shaken from its appointed purpose.

Milwaukee Journal Praises Watchdog Role of the General Accounting Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Elmer Staats as Comptroller General not only brings a very able man to the post but calls attention to a department unique in our Government.

This is the editorial opinion of the Milwaukee Journal, which points out that the General Accounting Office which the Comptroller heads "keeps constant check on expenditures" with auditors not only in this country but around the world. I include the editorial hereafter:

WASHINGTON WATCHDOG

The appointment of Elmer Staats, longtime Federal career employee, as Comptroller General not only brings a very able man to the post but calls attention to a department unique in our Government.

Staats will head the General Accounting Office. While appointed by the President he reports to the Congress. His appointment runs for 15 years and he can't be reappointed. Thus he need have no fear of treading on toes or of political repercussions.

Congress created the post in 1921 to give it a combination watch and hunting dog to prevent and track down mismanagement and wasteful spending. In 1964 the Comptroller General's Office got back \$320 million for the Federal Treasury. It keeps constant check on expenditures, and most particularly Defense Department expenses, for they are the highest in Government. The Office has auditors not only in this country but around the world. Often the Office is able to get voluntary return of funds paid in excess. When it can't or when it finds actual dishonesty or corruption it turns matters over to the Department of Justice.

Federal departments often complain about the Comptroller General and his staff, claiming that they are nit picking and pay too much attention to minor matters. The Comptroller's traditional answer is that minor matters in numbers can add up to

Girl Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, Ga., Girl Scouting was established in the United States bringing the many benefits and advantages of this movement to the girls of our Nation. This week, we are celebrating the birthday of the Girl Scout movement and I feel it is fitting that the Members of the House of Representatives pay tribute to this fine organization.

I would like to call to your attention the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Marengo, Iowa, Pioneer Republican, as I feel this editorial very aptly expresses the significance and importance of the Girl Scouts. I am sure we will all agree that the Girl Scout movement is certainly very deserving of our recognition.

The article follows:

DESERVES RECOGNITION

Some of the innumerable "days" and "weeks" which we are supposed to celebrate each year in this country are without any notable significance and importance. Some are unconsciously silly. Some are highly specialized and are of interest only to the few. But there are some which have earned and which deserve the recognition and support of us all.

That is true a dozen times over of Girl Scout week, which is to be observed this year during the March 6-12 period.

There are 150 girls and adult leaders in the Scouting program in Marengo and they will hold a court of awards at the high school auditorium Sunday afternoon, March 20. During Girl Scout week there will be a display in Gode's window.

The week's stated purpose is: "To celebrate the birthday of Girl Scouting in the United States." That birthday took place on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, Ga. In the intervening years, the movement has spread across the Nation bringing life-long benefits to legions of girls. They learn the arts and crafts and domestic virtues which are particularly suited to feminine temperament and inborn talent. They learn of the wonders of nature. They learn how to get along with each other, and to show respect and understanding and tolerance for the thoughts and aspirations and ambitions of others. They learn the disciplines and attitudes that are vital to a happy and useful life in society.

Above all—and this was never so vital as today—the Girl Scouts build character. They are the enemies of delinquency and the

March 8, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

a lot can be accomplished, but this is the exception, not the rule.

Now DSSP is faced with preparing for SeaLab III, among many other projects. (How the Air Force must wish that DSSP had been started years ago so that its A-bomb lying on the bottom off Spain could be readily retrieved.)

It is our fervent hope that funding will permit at least a partial systems approach to the project. By systems approach we mean—first, the thorough technical feasibility study, usually through industry contract, of a project before any part of the project is begun; second, systems engineering, or integration of the whole and determination of what each part should do; third, the selection of a prime contractor, whether Navy or industry.

One result of this kind of planning, now familiar to the aerospace industry through defense and NASA contracts, would be the logical scheduling of personnel assignments from the top on down. The Navy's SeaLabs I and II and Jacques-Yves Cousteau's Conshells I, II, and III create utter exhaustion in many key responsible officials. In this way they resembled the early days of the Mercury and Gemini space flights. Now NASA has the shift system and it works well. Admittedly, it means delegating authority down the line in order to get some sleep, but that is the mark of true leadership.

Another systems approach result would be cleaner hardware subsystems. By taking subsystems offered by industry and subjecting them to multiple thorough tests, the integrated whole could be built up until it, too, could be tested to satisfaction. As with space capsules going into orbit, there comes a time when the undersea habitat must be in place with all systems "go". Then it is time for the decision to get started and hope for the best.

Finally, as with aviation and space (and with driving an automobile for that matter), the risk element must be considered but not to the extent that it is an overriding factor to the detriment of the mission or a rock in the path of progress. Early aviation has its fatalities. Space (as far as we know) has had none. But an astronaut recently warned that as surely as the sun rises and sets, there will be a space tragedy some day. There have been diving fatalities in the past. But the diving fraternity must not let that deter progress. Pioneers, historically, fight on.

With these management and policy points stitched into a presentation for top defense officials—engineers, scientists, and budgeteers—a more liberally funded program could be forthcoming. Out of such a program a neat module would grow.

In the meantime a poor man's systems approach can be created using available talent in the Navy, especially that in the Special Projects (Polaris) office, and in industry. Then the breadboard could be put into a museum.

Who Does the Fighting—How About a Check?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today, 29 Republican colleagues joined me in calling for a congressional inquiry into inefficiencies and inequities

of the draft. I have been greatly encouraged by the tremendous response of the press and the general public. The following two articles, the first from the Lawrence Daily Journal World, of Lawrence, Kans., and the second from the New York Herald Tribune of New York City are especially thought provoking and I commend them to your attention:

[From the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, Mar. 1, 1966]

How About A Check?

If Republican congressional charges about Selective Service inefficiency are soundly based, the Johnson administration owes it to the American public to make some changes promptly.

Twenty-seven GOP members of Congress, with Lawrence's ROBERT ELLSWORTH as spokesman, have outlined three "bone of contention" about what they consider inefficiencies and inequities in the draft system. ELLSWORTH first announced the step during a visit to Lawrence Monday and that matter was aired nationally at a press conference today in Washington.

The three points stressed by the GOP group:

While the Selective Service system talks about reclassification plans and increased draft calls, there appear to be some 279,000 men in 1-A classification whose papers are bogged down between their boards and their induction centers.

"This means 279,000 men are available right now if we can cut the inefficiency," ELLSWORTH said.

On December 31, 1965, the Comptroller General of the United States reported to Congress that the Army, Navy and Air Force have over 9,000 enlisted men working at non-military jobs like running officers' clubs, bowling alleys, golf courses, and such.

Except for South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand, none of the U.S. allies have any combat troops in South Vietnam and our European allies haven't even met their manpower commitments in Western Europe.

The most immediately disturbing of the three points to most Americans right now is the first—the charge that some 279,000 draft-eligible young men already are snarled in Federal redtape while at the same time there are plans to ensnarl even more, perhaps at great cost and inconvenience.

Military service is a fact of life for virtually all young American males in this so-called cold war period, and it follows that everyone has to expect a certain amount of inconvenience, risk and disruption of plans and timetables in the interest of defense and public welfare. But the Government owes it to the citizenry that pays the bills and supplies the men to minimize all this just as much as possible, with fair and efficient operation of the draft system.

Selective Service bungling, as charged by the Republican group, touches many lives in many frustrating ways.

Take the student who is trying to complete his education; the young husband-father trying to get established on a new job; the businessman trying to keep a sound employee force. These are just a few of the examples. In a dangerous time of national emergency, all such people have to expect to make sacrifices of varying natures, but the Government owes it to them to keep the incidence as low as humanly possible.

Suppose there are as many 1-A young men available, as the Ellsworth group charges. Why not get maximum mileage from this group, with greater efficiency in Selective Service operations, before going into costly and inconveniencing reclassification and needless call-ups that waste manpower?

It would seem that such a 1-A pool could meet manpower needs for a long time to come, even with the Vietnam escalation, or

at least until more thorough studies can be made to see just what needs will be. This could well be a case of the all-too-typical Government policy of using a shotgun to do the job of a rifle—of howling for far more than is necessary to make sure you get enough.

It will be interesting to see how the Johnson administration responds to these latest charges about the Selective Service setup.

Just about anyone who has been closely connected with administration of military bases and installations will admit that efficiency is not normally a long suit of such an agency. It stands to reason, then, that there are quite a few personnel in non-military jobs such as the GOP group cites in its charges. However, there are a number of instances where such nonmilitary duties can be justified, particularly where base recreation programs are involved.

As for displeasure over the fact that allies have not responded in helping American efforts in places like Vietnam and Europe, that is understandable. This is a valid criticism. Chances are nobody would like to remedy this more than President Johnson. It is well to keep him aware that people want something done, but there are so many uncontrollable elements involved that it is unrealistic to expect miracles which will bring drastic changes.

The most vulnerable spot in the Johnson armor in this case would seem to be inefficiency and inequity in operation of the Selective Service System. If, as the GOP Congressmen say, there are problems due to mismanagement and redtape, the administration should swallow its pride and get something done in a hurry.

Selective Service participants and their families can vote, too.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 3, 1966]

WHO DOES THE FIGHTING?

The 30 House Republicans who are calling for a congressional investigation of the draft and the overall problem of recruiting military manpower have opened a different side to the Vietnam debate. Its gist is not whether or how we fight, but who does the fighting.

The Congressmen urged that the war be prosecuted—it must be. But they are also saying that it can be prosecuted most feasibly and effectively with a broad base of international support for the South Vietnamese and, in America, by elimination of the anxiety-causing confusion and inequities of our present manpower procurement policies.

Whether we are doing all we can to persuade allies to provide troops, technicians, and economic assistance is a delicate matter of diplomacy best investigated in closed sessions. However, Congress can properly ask the question.

Domestically, any investigation of manpower procurement should start with the draft. Selective Service System Director Gen. Lewis B. Hershey defends the operations of his agency, but the statistics which describe the inefficiency of the draft (which, in fairness, includes the Army's operation of induction centers) are right out of his own office. In any case, an independent survey of conditions in the draft process could be profitably undertaken by Congress.

But the draft, so long ignored by Congress, is just one part of the manpower procurement problem. Indeed, the other parts—policies affecting regulars and reservists, and such as poverty program and Peace Corps personnel—usually have been treated apart from one another, and there is need for coordination. Inefficient utilization of the 3 million men already in uniform may seem at a tolerable level to the eyes of a particular military service, but if it means more draftees—married men or students, as examples—it should be a matter of high level

A1306

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 8, 1966

concern. The Reserves may worry solely over their responsibilities in case of activation, but if an incentive program for individual reservists to volunteer for Vietnam is feasible, it, too—as a prospect for relieving the manpower strain—is a proper interest of higher authority. Congress, until the manpower policies are reformed, should exercise that authority.

Matter of Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, any differences over U.S. policies in Vietnam are matters of degree, rather than of substance.

This, in the opinion of the New York Herald Tribune, was the principal truth emerging from the Senate hearings on the Vietnamese war.

The paper is convinced:

The Vietcong do not want a compromise. If given a portion of the South Vietnamese Government, they would almost certainly use it—as the Communists in every “popular front” government have done since the end of World War II—to subvert the whole structure.

This agrees with the warning which I issued in this connection in my February 21, 1966, statement to the House when I questioned the proposal of the junior Senator from New York to admit the Vietcong to governmental responsibility. The subsequent Chinese statement lumping U.S. hawks and doves together as “fools” confirms the Communist intransigence.

Overall, the hearings—the Herald Tribune believes—have developed “how broad the consensus on aims really is.”

I thought the editorial a good analysis of the matter, and because I feel that others may glean informative material from it, I insert it in the Record.

THE PROBLEM OF DEGREE

If any fact has emerged from the Senate hearings on the Vietnamese war, it is that, in the main, differences over American policy are matters of degree, rather than of substance. There are some in the Senate (Mr. Morse, for example) who believe that the United States is in a fundamentally immoral position in southeast Asia. But these are relatively few. More are concerned with the rate of escalation and the ultimate prospect. They would limit rather than change the American commitment.

General Taylor made a convincing refutation, from the military point of view, of the charge that the United States is engaged in a limitless adventure in Asia. Secretary of State Rusk, in the course of replies to questions that brought repeated expressions of praise from Senators representing every point of view, took up the charge that while the American purpose in southeast Asia might be limited geographically, it was, so far as South Vietnam was concerned, politically unlimited.

This charge took two forms. One was that the United States, if it expected the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to come to the conference table, should state specif-

ically its terms for a settlement. An aspect of this was the idea that the Vietcong should be directly approached with compromise suggestions.

Now, obviously, once the United States sets forth terms of settlement, it would be bound by them while the enemy would not. It would be an open invitation to Hanoi and the Vietcong to insist upon more; it would leave no flexibility for bargaining—indeed, it would virtually rule out bargaining. So far as direct relations with the Vietcong are concerned, Mr. Rusk cited the case of Laos, where the Pathet Lao Communist faction were not content with the 1962 Geneva agreement (which involved the acceptance of a “neutralist” as Premier, at Communist insistence) but sought to undo the agreement by force and fraud and are now fighting their own former allies.

The Vietcong do not want a compromise. If given a portion of the South Vietnamese Government, they would almost certainly use it—as the Communists in every “popular front” government have done since the end of World War II—to subvert the whole structure. There is absolutely no indication that they are as yet willing to rest their case on free elections. No revolutionary group dominated by Communists has ever done so, from North Vietnam to Cuba.

So, if the United States is to achieve its goal of allowing the South Vietnamese to determine their own destiny, it cannot do so with the Vietcong recognized as a part of the government or even as a state within a state. They must be willing to take their case to the people in an internationally supervised election. The results of that, Mr. Rusk said, we would accept.

Another phase of the question of degree is the matter of somehow limiting American participation. This, in a shooting war, is virtually impossible to do in advance. The rate of escalation, too, is in large part determined by enemy action. Given agreement of fundamental goals, the manner of achieving them is largely a practical military matter. And the hearings have developed, possibly to the surprise of the chairman, Mr. Fulbright, how broad the consensus on aims really is.

Soviet Reassesses Atheist Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the status of religion in the Soviet Union has been of deep and continuing concern to the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have been directly involved in the subcommittee's activities intended to place in the public record such facts as we may be able to obtain about the condition of religion in Communist-dominated countries.

Last year, for example, the subcommittee held extensive hearings on this subject. These hearings, and the accompanying report, were published under the title, “Antireligious Activities in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe.”

Mr. Speaker, because of our interest, I was very pleased to note the lengthy and informative article by M. S. Handler en-

itled “Soviet Reassesses Atheist Drive,” which appeared in the March 7, 1966, edition of the New York Times. I believe that the information contained in the article will be of interest to Members of the Congress. For this reason, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

SOVIET REASSESSSES ATHEIST DRIVE—VIGOR OF
ORTHODOX CHURCH BEWILDERS PARTY AGI-
TATORS

(By M. S. Handler)

The Soviet Communist Party is in the process of reappraising its campaign against the Russian Orthodox Church.

The reappraisal, as discussed in Communist Party newspapers and publications, indicates that the official antireligious agitators are bewildered by the resistance of the provincial remnants of the Russian Orthodox Church.

They are disturbed by what seems to be the growth of an underground church among the peasants and villagers who, deprived of regular churches and priests, are practicing religious rites in secret.

The reassessment was initiated last year by atheist agitators critical of false assumptions on which the half-century campaign to eradicate religion was based. These assumptions were that police, judicial, and arbitrary administrative measures could uproot religion.

Evidence of the reassessment and the harsh measures still employed against the Russian Orthodox Church in remote areas was assembled by scholars in Western Europe and the United States from published Soviet and confidential sources. Because of the physical problems of attempting in Moscow to assess the condition of a church that is still believed to have as many as 45-million believers in the farflung regions of the Soviet Union, the task was undertaken in New York.

It is generally agreed by Russian Orthodox authorities in this country and in Western Europe that Patriarch Aleksei, leader of the Soviet church, has fought a hard and resourceful battle to save Russian orthodoxy.

However they believe that the real power has passed from the 89-year-old patriarch to Archbishop Nikodim, a young churchman who seems to have the full favor of the Soviet authorities and who represents the Russian Orthodox Church at the World Council of Churches.

Archbishop Nikodim is said to represent the face of the Russian Orthodox Church that is turned to the outside world. He completed his secondary and higher theological education by correspondence in 5 years instead of the normal 12. Nikodim took monastic vows in 1947 and his rise in the hierarchy was swift.

The curtain was raised on the reappraisal last August 15 by G. Kelt of Lwow with a harsh attack in Komsomolskaya Pravda, newspaper of the Young Communists, on the concepts and methods employed in the atheism campaign.

The writer, active in the campaign, acknowledged, in the following passage, the existence of an underground church:

“Today we are deceiving ourselves, again that ‘many believers in our country leave the church and religion.’ This is self-deception. It is true there are not churches and no ministers in a large part of the Soviet Union. But there are believers. If they are not orthodox, they are members of one or another of the multitude of finely differentiated sects.”

“Where do they come from? From the ranks of those who leave the church. For, as has been said in official statements, closing a parish does not make atheists of believers. On the contrary, it strengthens the attraction of religion for people and it embitters their hearts besides.”

It is now clear however, that the costs of providing a family with all the social services envisioned in the President's message were grossly miscalculated.

Accordingly there are two separate moves afoot to "rationalize" the program as one committee member put it. One is to enlarge greatly the \$2.3-billion fund to meet the program's targets without increasing other Federal programs. The other is to keep the \$2.3-billion figure and limit the number of cities involved.

Colonel Cawthra's Action in Vietnam War Cited in Recent Story on Wolfhounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to bring my colleagues' attention to the bravery and perseverance in the defense of his country of Col. James Cawthra, a Wyoming constituent. As commander of the 1st Battalion of the 27th Infantry's Wolfhounds, Colonel Cawthra's courageous activity was reported in the following Associated Press release, which I am proud to submit to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COLONEL CAWTHRA'S ACTION IN VIETNAM WAR
CITED IN RECENT STORY ON WOLFHOUSES

(NOTE.—The action of Lt. Col. James Cawthra, of Riverton, in the Vietnam war was recently cited in an Associated Press article on the 27th Infantry's Wolfhounds. The story, as printed in the February 10 issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, follows.)

(By Al Chang)

CHUCHI, VIETNAM.—During the Korean war the Wolfhounds were known as the fire brigade. They're moving into the same role here in Vietnam.

The 27th Infantry, part of the U.S. 25th Division, came here last month from its home base in Hawaii and ran into its first big clash with the Vietcong over the weekend.

The 27th added the adjective "Gentle" to the name "Wolfhounds" in Korea and Japan because of the outfit's work with orphans. Members of the unit have contributed thousands of dollars for establishing and maintaining orphanages.

But here they haven't yet had a chance to develop the "Gentle Wolfhounds" tradition. Shortly after reaching Vietnam they moved into this area about 25 miles north-west of Saigon.

It has long been a Vietcong domain. Weeks later they still find that every day means an ordeal of sniper fire—sometimes even in headquarters areas—mines and boobytraps.

And sometimes they find there is more to it than daily harassment from the almost unseen enemy.

A Wolfhound company operating out of Chuchi ran into a strong Vietcong force well hidden in trenches and spider holes. The Vietcong popped up and mostly by means of rifle grenades, hit the American troops hard.

The company's first sergeant, Leonard Letota, of Honolulu, described it this way: "They came out of deep entrenched fox-holes and an array of tunnels, fired a few rounds and moved underground to fire from different positions. Their fire was very accurate.

"During the heavy firefight the company took more casualties by trying to save and

carry out the wounded. I saw two medics get hit. One of them was hit twice and another three times."

The company commander was hit by shrapnel but he stayed with his men and kept fighting throughout the day.

Sgt. Robert L. Little, of Doraville, Ga., ran under a deadly blanket of heavy fire for 150 yards to pick up and help carry back dead and wounded.

There were many examples of heroism among the Wolfhounds that Saturday.

The battalion surgeon, Capt. Donald G. Winningham, of Seattle, Wash., told of the toll suffered by the Americans.

"We started having casualties from about 10 o'clock in the morning and it went on until late at night," he said. "They were mostly from shrapnel and fragments. The medical aid tent was busy throughout the day and into the night after the battle had broken off."

A dark the fighting ended and the Wolfhounds could look back on their first major fighting in the Vietnamese war. Although they had taken casualties, they believed they inflicted bloody losses on the Vietcong. There was no estimate of enemy dead or wounded.

Lt. Col. James Cawthra, of Riverton, Wyo., commander of the 1st Battalion, spent 7 hours hovering above the battlefield in a helicopter, one of the many choppers that came under enemy fire.

When the day ended, he said "The Wolfhounds have done a good job. We have had a lot of casualties, hitting from those dug-in tunnels and trenches. But considering the number of casualties, only a few will be evacuated out of the unit.

"Most of them will be back in a day or so to fight again. Their morale is high. You can see that by the spirit of the wounded."

(NOTE.—Al Chang, Hawaii-born A.P. photographer, was with the U.S. 27th Infantry Wolfhounds in the Korean war. He was with them over the weekend when they had their first sharp engagement in Vietnam with the Vietcong.)

Support Given

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the country is more united and therefore the prospect of a solution and peace in Vietnam should brighten, the Columbia, S.C., State editorially asserts.

Speaking of the Senate hearings, this great paper said:

It was not pleasant to hear the hard facts of the situation, but it is right and necessary to face up to them. Congress has done so in a demonstration of bipartisanship at its best. The country should, and will, do likewise.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the State's splendid editorial of March 3 to my colleagues and to the people of our country:

SUPPORTING THE WAR

Congress having again expressed itself, the prospect of solution and peace in Vietnam should brighten.

Although there was never any doubt but that the extra appropriation for the war would be made, the debate over policy in-

evitably cast fresh doubts over the country and undoubtedly tended to encourage Communists everywhere.

And the debate will go on. Open and free discussion is in the American tradition and it is a tradition which should not be abandoned.

But the almost-unanimous vote in the Senate on the additional funds strongly suggests a national rallying behind the effort and a resolve to be energetically about the business of gaining a firm and honorable termination of the war.

The testimony of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor and Secretary of State Dean Rusk unquestionably clarified the issue for most citizens needing further explanation. And while critics in Congress could scarcely have been expected to confess a sudden transformation on their part, they, too, felt the impact of the showings made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the two men.

General Taylor said we must not change course, and Mr. Rusk propounded once more, with convincing clarity, the requirements of freedom which are so deeply involved in our stand.

It was not pleasant to hear the hard facts of the situation, but it is right and necessary to face up to them. Congress has done so in a demonstration of bipartisanship at its best. The country should, and will, do likewise. This should give the Communists pause and instill fresh hope in free men.

W. Perry Doing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Mathias and I were deeply grieved by the tragic death of W. Perry Doing, member of the Maryland House of Delegates from Montgomery County.

Perry Doing was a generous, energetic, and conscientious man who will be sorely missed by his countless friends and his colleagues in the Maryland General Assembly. Mrs. Mathias and I extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Doing and his four children, Michael, Patricia, deForrest, and Ronald.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the resolution passed by the Maryland General Assembly on February 21:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 40

Resolution expressing the deepest regret of the House of Delegates of Maryland over the sudden passing of the Honorable W. Perry Doing

The members of the House of Delegates of Maryland were grievously shocked and saddened over the sudden passing of our good friend and colleague, the Honorable W. Perry Doing, a member of the house from Montgomery County.

His loss brings to every member of this body a deep personal sense of sorrow and regret and a poignant recollection of the close ties of respect and friendship we held for him.

W. Perry Doing was born in Washington, D.C., on March 3, 1921. He attended the public schools in Washington and in the year 1942 received the degree of LL.B. from Columbia Law School. He became a member of the Maryland bar in 1954.

The Secretary of State brought that matter up himself during his testimony before the Fulbright committee Friday. He said:

"I have observed in the course of your hearings that some objection has been raised to the use of the term 'Communist aggression.' It seems to me that we should not confuse ourselves or our people by turning our eyes away from what that phrase means. * * * The Communist world has returned to its demand for what it calls 'a world revolution.'"

We Americans must recognize, said Secretary Rusk, that "expansion and extension of Communist domination by the use of force" against weak nations bordering Communist powers is a key part of that world revolution. As for the present war, Mr. Rusk said:

"We are in Vietnam because the issues posed there are deeply intertwined with our own security and because the outcome of the struggle can profoundly affect the nature of the world in which we and our children will live."

Mr. Rusk is no orator, and perhaps his training as a diplomat causes him to use more words than are necessary. But the thought is clear and unqualified: America is fighting Communist aggression, and America cannot afford to let the Communist win.

The message is simple. It is effective. The Hanoi radio is said to mention Mr. Rusk's name more often than that of any other American except President Johnson, and his name always is prefaced by a fusillade of vilifying adjectives.

So here's to Dean Rusk, an unlikely hero if there ever was, but a man who seems to have a one-track mind about Communist aggression—a man who has looked good when the going was rough. We admire his steadfastness, and we hope that he never will waver.

Cities Demonstration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1966, there appeared in the New York Times an article dealing with the President's cities demonstration program.

I submit for the consideration of my colleagues the article, together with my comments thereon:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., March 8, 1966.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I read with interest your article on Monday, March 7, 1966, dealing with the President's cities demonstration program.

The President's proposal, which is currently being studied in Congress, outlines a dynamic approach to eliminate blighted areas from a physical, social, and economic standpoint in a number of cities. As a New Yorker, I am vitally concerned with the waste of human resources and the poverty which characterize a number of sections in Manhattan. I believe that the \$2.3 billion requested by the President for the cities demonstration program is a beginning in America's battle to adequately improve urbanized society, where 4 out of 5 Americans will live and work in cities by the year 2000.

To suggest that the appropriation is insufficient to achieve a meaningful contribution in the rehabilitation of urban areas would be correct if this were a terminal point. However, in addition to the suggested appropriation, other Federal funds from existing programs, carried out by many departments of Government, will also be channeled into the designated cities demonstration areas.

I am also hopeful that my amendment to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (H.R. 10855) authorizing Federal economic development assistance to compact and contiguous areas with a population of 200,000 or more will be enacted in the current session of the Congress. I have reason to believe that the figure may be reduced to include compact and contiguous areas of 100,000. If this amendment is enacted, additional funds could be applied to the city demonstration approach.

We must approach the problem of rehabilitating great urban areas with a degree of prudence to insure that local initiative and foresight are brought into the planning and execution of the program. As the President said in his message to the Congress: "Let there be debate over means and priorities. Let there be experiment with a dozen approaches, or a hundred. But let there be commitment to that goal." I echo these sentiments. We in Congress must decide the scope of the cities demonstration program, given our current fiscal commitments to defense and other existing domestic programs. I, personally, shall do all I can to assure adequate funds for this important new program.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTAIN,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 7, 1966]

SLUM PLAN SETS CONCERN IN HOUSE—KEY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS BELIEVE JOHNSON PROGRAM NEEDS BIG RISE IN FUNDS

(By Robert B. Semple, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—There is growing concern here that the proposed demonstration cities program, for cleaning up slums, cannot work unless substantially more money is poured into it or existing Federal programs.

Key members of the Housing subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee have reached this stark and potentially troublesome conclusion. The subcommittee has heard a week of testimony on the much-publicized plan, on which President Johnson has pinned his hopes for improving city slum areas.

Under the President's plan a city applying for Federal aid would select one or possibly two blighted neighborhoods and submit an over-all plan for their rejuvenation.

AID PLANNED—\$2.3 BILLION

The project would include housing for different income groups, with emphasis on those with lower incomes, as well as the health, education, welfare and other social services necessary to change the environment of the projects' residents.

Cities meeting a list of broad Federal criteria, including need and administrative capability, would be eligible for a share of \$2.3 billion in Federal aid, spread over 5 years. They would also receive what Mr. Johnson described as "the complete array of all available Federal grants and urban aids in the fields of housing, renewal, transportation, education, welfare, economic opportunity and related programs."

The President's message submitting the proposal to Congress said that 60 to 70 cities would be chosen to participate in the demonstration program.

A survey of subcommittee sentiment suggests that most members accept the admin-

istration view that the plan is an imaginative and long overdue approach to solving slum problems.

But they fear \$2.3 billion is not nearly enough to fulfill the program's promise.

Nor are they happy about the possible courses they believe are open to them if they try to match the capabilities of the program to the President's rhetoric.

COULD INCREASE FUNDS

One course would be to increase funds for the program or, alternatively, the authorized levels of the many existing programs that are expected to be used as part of the demonstration cities plan. But they believe this course would involve enormous legislative difficulties and would invite criticism from the inflation-conscious Congress.

A second approach would be to reduce the number of cities involved in the plan. This would be equally risky because the program needs broad support on the House floor to pass.

A third course would be to revise downward the expectations of the plan by limiting the funds available to each participating city. But this might violate the Presidential dictum that the program be of sufficient magnitude to make "a substantial impact within the coming few years on the development of the entire city."

This largely unexpected concern has arisen in the last week for three main reasons:

First, the committee has been troubled by repeated testimony from mayors of large cities. The mayors have said that if the program, as Mr. Johnson promises, makes available to demonstration cities the "complete array of all available grants and aids," it will tend to divert these funds from communities that do not participate in the demonstration program.

Despite assertions to the contrary from Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, committee members tend to agree that this would be true. To avoid such discrimination and diversion, they believe that the total Federal outlay for urban renewal and other Federal aid would necessarily have to be increased.

Second, some committee members believe that the problem of diversion or discrimination could be aggravated by a financing mechanism in the administration bill. They believe it would tend to encourage cities competing for the demonstration funds to put still further pressure on existing Federal programs.

The bill says that the Government will pay 80 percent of the local share of Federal grant-in-aid projects that are focused on the demonstration area.

Communities usually pay one-third of the net cost of urban renewal projects and the Government two-thirds. Under the bill the Government would pick up 80 percent of the community's old one-third share.

This mechanism, some committee members believe, would encourage communities to seek additional funds from a wide variety of Federal agencies to be able to enlarge the base on which their share of the demonstration program's money would be computed. Many of these agencies are already oversubscribed and short of cash.

Third, there is a growing belief in the committee and among housing experts here that the administration badly underestimated the cost of certain important social aspects of the program. As a result, they believe the \$2.3 billion requested by the President is grossly inadequate to do the kind of job he set out to do.

The \$2.3-billion figure proposed by Mr. Johnson was arrived at by determining how much it would cost to meet certain physical and social goals in 60 to 70 cities and then subtracting from this the amount the cities would recover by selling to private owners the dwelling units constructed or rehabilitated under the program.

March 8, 1966

A1309

you on this delightful occasion I was doubly pleased to accept and join with you in honoring an old friend who has distinguished himself in the practice of medicine. Again, it was nearly 40 years ago that I first knew Dr. Huggins, then a handsome virile young doctor just making his way into the hearts and confidence of the people in this county. A South Carolinian of Carolina parents, a graduate of one of the fine medical schools, Dr. Huggins even then was unselfish of his talents and his energy, serving alike those who could pay and those who could not.

He worked long hours, day and night, in the high incidence of killing diseases—colitis, typhoid, malaria, and hookworms, and by sheer force of his dedicated efforts helped make Walton County one of the healthy, delightful places in which to live and raise fine families.

With the exception of time devoted to medicine in the armed services during World War I, he has practiced in Walton County since 1912, devoting his time and his efforts not only to his profession but to the community as a whole, as a churchworker, as a worker in the field of education, in public service, in fraternal activities and, in general, offering a broad shoulder upon which the people of his choice could lean in time of need.

It was largely at Dr. Huggins' instigation and as a consequence of his determination that Walton County finally secured long-needed hospital facilities. And it was because of his guidance over the years as chief of staff of that hospital that it attained a high degree of perfection and efficiency in ministering to the ills of the people. All in all, Dr. Huggins' life with you here has been one of public service and it is more than fitting that you recognize him as one of your great citizens in naming the hospital the E. L. Huggins Memorial Hospital. I should like to join all of the people of this county in thanking the board of trustees for their recognition of this man and his devotion to their needs.

I am apprehensive that none of us here will again see in this country of ours the development of a medical center built, maintained, and operated on the public will and dogged determination of private citizens. I doubt if few of you will ever experience in the future the quality of personal attention Dr. Huggins and his colleagues have been able to give to his patients. The medical profession is fast being handcuffed to a Federal bureaucracy under which care will be dispensed with a computerized sort of impersonal and detached indifference.

And it staggers the imagination to contemplate the changes which have occurred in the last 30 years. Our manner of government and our way of life are, for the United States, new and novel, with little in common with what has gone before. Our forebears would be astounded by the insidious encroachments of centralized government in our everyday life.

Government is in the business of housing the people, in prescribing the hours we can work, with whom we must work, the salaries we are paid and the tax to be withheld from the salary, the schools our children can attend and with whom they must sit and play, the highways we can drive on, how and where our food is grown and processed. The Government concerns itself with the products you buy, the conditions under which they are manufactured, the manner in which they are advertised, the kind, the shape, and the size of the package in which they are offered and how they are labeled. It is meddling with your health, your general welfare, your old age and your retirement, your security after retirement, your savings and the banks in which you place your savings, the conduct of your city, its police department and its department of health; the conduct of the affairs of your State, its law

enforcement, its elections, the composition of its legislature, and every other facet of your life, private and public.

But the people of this country may like all this—to say the least, they have asked for it. They have elected the public officials who brought it about and they sit around with their tin cups waiting for more. If that's what a majority of the people of this Nation want, those of us who disagree can't complain. The majority has the right to change our form of government if it wishes.

But one unfortunate aspect is that, once the die is finally cast, it will be too late to change our minds; it's altogether unlikely we could then ever reestablish the kind of government, the kind of independence and individuality our forefathers conceived and anticipated for posterity. We will have come too far and given up too much.

For that reason it is important that we give some thought to what is happening and reach some conclusions about what we'd like our future to be. We must count the cost of all the politically inspired humanitarian claptrap and be sure we're willing to pay the price in freedom, liberty, and independence.

In good conscience, we cannot say the Federal encroachments upon our rights and the rights of the States have come with any surprise. We have been warned and warned again. Cicero told us what to expect. When our ancestors were considering the adoption of the Federal Constitution, Patrick Henry warned: "Be extremely cautious, watchful, jealous of your liberty. Instead of securing your rights, you may lose them forever." He said, "This Government will * * * destroy the State governments and swallow the liberties of the people."

George Mason said that a centralized government "is totally subversive of every principle which has hitherto governed us."

William Grayson, suspicious of the proposed Supreme Court, said, "This Court has more power than any court under heaven * * *" and George Mason agreed.

Benjamin Franklin, anticipating a people negligent in safeguarding their rights, said he thought our Government would be well administered for a few years but that it "can only end in despotism."

George Washington warned of the dangers inherent in an unrestrained Supreme Court. Thomas Jefferson warned of the evils of judicial encroachment.

Some years later Lord Macauley warned our Government would be destroyed from within by our own people.

Abraham Lincoln warned against allowing the Supreme Court to meddle with policy questions.

Woodrow Wilson in 1912 told the people: "A concentration of governmental power is what always precedes the death of human liberty."

No, we cannot have been surprised by what has happened because, from our earliest days we have been on notice it would happen. We, very simply, have refused to heed the warnings.

It is no longer of first importance whether we collectivize the professions or bankrupt the Nation in abolishing poverty or in supporting our enemies abroad—the vital question, the question in the face of which all others fade to insignificance, is whether we save the Constitution of the United States and the republican form of government established by it.

Perhaps Benjamin Franklin knew what he was talking about when, in substance, he told the young Nation, after it had adopted its Constitution, they had gained a free and independent Nation but did not have the commonsense to keep it.

Thank you for asking me over to have a part in this ceremony and to express, once again, our warm affection, respect, and esteem for our mutual friend, Dr. Huggins.

The Escalating War on Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, "It isn't too late yet, but someday, perhaps sooner than we think, it could be." This is a warning from a recent Chicago Sun-Times editorial which focused on President Johnson's natural resources message.

How true those words ring when we think of the horribly polluted water and air throughout our country. Millions of citizens are deprived of clean drinking, fishing, and swimming water. As an example, Lake Erie, bordering on my own district, is a disgrace to our Nation. Some even say that it is beyond help.

These same citizens, particularly those in urban areas, must breathe poisonous air every day of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message to the Congress was forthright and practical. It asks nothing that can not be accomplished through cooperative earnest efforts. And it provides funds to those localities which are willing to take action immediately.

The editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times points out that many will feel that the President's message went too far. This is hardly the case in light of our present polluted water and air. Others will feel that it has not gone far enough. Perhaps they are right, for sooner than we think it will be too late.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times for all to read in its entirety:

SAVING NATURE'S BOUNTY

President and Mrs. Johnson have consistently made known their concern for the natural beauty and resources of America. The President has now focused that concern in a massive program to clean the Nation's air and water and preserve its scenic masterpieces.

In a special message presenting the program to Congress, the President emphasized the "magnitude of the choice before us, and its consequences for every child born on this continent from this day forward." Much is at stake, and much is proposed. The total cost of cleaning up the Nation's rivers, for instance, was estimated at between \$20 and \$30 billion (under the proposal the Federal Government would pay 30 percent and the communities 70 percent).

Thousands of acres would be encompassed in a nationwide enlargement of parks and preserves (the President urged approval in 1966 of Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in Indiana and Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan). The President would also revise procedures to facilitate the curtailment of air and water pollution, including increased authority for the Government to act against pollution that "constitutes an imminent danger to public health and welfare."

Large as are the proposals, one phase proved disappointing to California conservationists. David Brewer, executive director of the Sierra Club, said that President Johnson's plans for a Redwood National Park in northern California placed it on the wrong

A1310

March 8, 1966

site and did not envision a large enough acreage. There will no doubt be other objections, including the expected ones from the loggers and from citizens who object automatically to governmental spending.

But the President has attacked a large problem that calls for large solutions. Millions of city dwellers live near water they cannot drink, and cannot swim, fish or boat in, because it is polluted. Industry and municipalities are so polluting large bodies of water that they will no longer support fish and cannot be used by people in any way. The very existence of some water resources is endangered. The President pointed out that every river in the country now suffers some degree of contamination, and that in Lake Erie alone 32 swimming areas had been closed and the blue pike catch there reduced from 20 million pounds in 1937 to 7,000 pounds in 1960 because the oxygen supply necessary for fish had been consumed by algae fed by pollutants. Unless the process is reversed, Lake Erie is doomed.

So will be other bodies of water, and so will the redwoods of California and many another of nature's magnificent creations, unless man's spoilage of his own environment is halted. The job is one for all to undertake, as individuals and as citizens of communities, States, and the Nation. It isn't yet too late, but someday, perhaps sooner than you think, it could be.

Charges Against the Bank Merger Act Confirmed by Justice Department Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the objections and charges that have been made against the Bank Merger Act passed this year were confirmed and reinforced by the Department of Justice. In a letter solicited by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California in connection with a bank merger case pending before that court, the Department of Justice expressed its views on the recent bank merger legislation.

In the opinion of the Department of Justice, the new bank merger legislation has not substantially changed anything. The letter from the Justice Department dated February 28, 1966, says of the new act:

It is our view that it has not resulted in any substantial change in substantive antitrust law.

It is also the opinion of the Department of Justice that while the purpose of the new law is to define uniform standards to be applied by the banking agencies and the courts in judging bank mergers, the supposed differences in the standards have been overstated. The letter from the Department of Justice continues:

Moreover, insofar as uniformity is concerned, what the new law does is impose on the banking agencies responsibility for giving—not just equal—but paramount con-

sideration to the competitive implications of bank mergers. This is what the courts in antitrust cases, including Philadelphia, have always done.

In other words, it is the opinion of the Department of Justice, that as far as the law with respect to bank mergers is concerned, the recent Bank Merger Act makes no substantial contribution. This, of course, is what those of us who opposed the act claimed. But it explains only in part my opposition in committee and in debate. And it only partially explains my strong recommendation that the bill be vetoed.

For, if it is true that the Bank Merger Act makes no substantial change in the law with respect to bank mergers, it may well be asked by the Members of Congress and the people, why did we spend so much time, effort, and money to pass the bill? Why, indeed, did we enact a public law containing no contributions to the public law, but granting retroactive forgiveness to three bank mergers and extending private relief to the banks involved?

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Record the text of the letter from the Department of Justice to the U.S. District Court in California, dated February 28, 1966:

FEBRUARY 28, 1966.

Re *United States v. Crocker-Angelo National Bank, et al.* (Civ. action No. 41808 (N.D. of Calif. S.D.)).

HON. ALFONSO J. ZIRPOLI,
U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Southern Division, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR JUDGE ZIRPOLI: This letter is submitted in response to the court's "Notice to Counsel" dated February 10, 1966, calling for an expression of views as to further steps, if any, to be taken in this cause in light of the recent bank merger law passed by the Congress, and signed by the President on February 21, 1966. A copy of the law (Public Law 89-366; 80 Stat. 7) as so enacted is attached hereto for the convenience of the court.

We do not believe any additional steps need be taken by the court.

While a purpose of the law is to define uniform standards to be applied by the banking agencies and the courts in judging bank mergers, it is our position that the supposed differences in the standards applied have been overstated. Moreover, insofar as uniformity is concerned, what the new law does is impose on the banking agencies responsibility for giving—not just equal—but paramount consideration to the competition implications of bank mergers. This is what the courts in antitrust cases, including Philadelphia, have always done.

Under paragraph 5 of the new law, bank regulatory agencies are now prohibited from approving merger transactions which have substantial anticompetitive effects, unless those anticompetitive effects are "clearly outweighed" in the public interest by the probable effect of the transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served. This is a substantial burden. As noted from paragraph 7 (A) and (B) any judicial proceeding attacking a merger is to be a de novo proceeding with respect to which the courts are to apply the same standards as those specified in paragraph 5.

While the new legislation thus gives emphasis to the need for uniformity in the bank merger field, it is our view that it has not resulted in any substantial change in sub-

stantive antitrust law. In this respect the court already has before it the evidence submitted under the term "convenience and needs." As a factor in the Bank Merger Act of 1960, the date on it was already elicited from the merging parties and appraised by the Comptroller at the time the matter was pending before him in 1963. It is contained in the record of this court in exhibit 13 of defendants' detailed application to the Comptroller (court's exhibit 195) and pages 43-44, 59 of the Comptroller's Opinion approving the merger (defendants' exhibit BK-A).

Respectfully yours,

DONALD F. TURNER,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust
Division.

HERBERT G. SCHOETKA,
Attorney, Department of Justice.

Steadfastness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Rusk is "a man who has looked good when the going was rough," the Omaha World-Herald has observed, adding:

We admire his steadfastness, and we hope that he never will waver.

The paper states that the thought of the Secretary "is clear and unqualified: America is fighting 'Communist aggression,' and America cannot afford to let the Communists win."

According to this paper, "The message is simple. It is effective," and it hails the Secretary as "perhaps the administration's most effective civilian spokesman, the most uncompromising, the most unswerving in his view that 'Communist aggression' must be stopped."

I believe others may want to read the opinions voiced in this forthright editorial, and with that in mind I am herewith offering the article for the RECORD:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Feb. 19, 1966]

UNBENDING MR. RUSK

A few months ago, it would have seemed remarkable if Columnist Alice Widener had written a column giving Dean Rusk a pat on the back for his "word-bullets" directed at those who would weaken America's war effort in Vietnam.

Mrs. Widener's column saying exactly that appeared on this page yesterday. And there was nothing remarkable about it.

Mr. Rusk may be colorless and softspoken. But on the Vietnam war he is perhaps the administration's most effective civilian spokesman, the most uncompromising, the most unswerving in his view that Communist aggression must be stopped.

If the test of a man is to be found in those who dislike or fear him, Mr. Rusk comes off very well. The mild little Secretary of State has the appeasers seething with indignation. He has been called worse than McNamara or the President because he chooses to talk about Communist aggression. His foes are sick to death of the phrase and of Mr. Rusk.